City of Lafayette Staff Report

For:	City Council
By:	Tony Coe
	Niroop K. Srivatsa
Date Written:	May 4, 2009
Meeting Date:	May 11, 2009
Subject:	**Lafayette Impact Fees Analysis: Upgrading and Updating the Drainage and Walkways Fees**

Purpose

Conduct the public hearing on updating and upgrading the drainage impact and walkways fees, introduce Ordinance 583 amending Chapter 8-1 of the Lafayette Municipal Code relating to Walkways Impact Fees and Ordinance 584 amending Chapter 8-17 of the Lafayette Municipal Code relating to Drainage Impact Fees and continue to the May 27th meeting for the second reading of the ordinances and the adoption of associated resolutions.

Background

In 2007, Seifel Consulting, Inc. was hired to review the City's impact fee program to determine (1) what is currently working well, (2) which fees need to be updated and (3) new fees that the City could impose in the future. The firm completed its initial assessment and presented its findings to the City Council on March 26, 2007. One of the recommendations was to update and upgrade the walkways fee and the drainage fee. This task was approved in the planning division's work plan for 2008 and was carried over to 2009. Seifel, Inc. completed the analysis and presented its findings and recommendations at the March 23rd meeting. The City Council accepted the reports and authorized staff to schedule a public hearing.

Drainage Fee

In 1985, the City adopted a drainage fee for the purpose of funding a citywide drainage master plan that would identify the drainage facilities needed to support existing and future new developments in Lafayette. The drainage fee is currently $0.10/SF and is charged on any increase to the impervious surface area in residential and commercial developments. The City collected $18,513 in drainage fees in FY2006/07 and $18,253 in FY2007/08.

The proposed drainage fee will continue to fund updates to the drainage master plan and will also allow the City to provide drainage facilities and infrastructure to meet the demand

10C

generated by new development. The proposed fee is $0.57/SF which includes administrative costs.

Walkways Fee

The walkways fee was established in 1969 for the purpose of providing a comprehensive system of walkways in the City. A Master Walkways Plan was adopted in 1999 and updated in 2006. The fee of $50 a dwelling unit has not been increased since it was initially adopted. The City collected $850 in walkways fees in FY2006/07 and $500 in FY2007/08.

The proposed walkways fee will be assessed on new residential development that will result in an increase in resident population. The fees will be used to construct walkways listed in the Master Walkways Plan and the pedestrian walkway portion of the Aqueduct Trail. The fee is based on the type of residential unit and the number of persons per unit. The fee ranges from $408 for a second unit to $1,141 for a detached single family unit and includes the administrative costs.

Staff Comments

Staff recommends adoption of the ordinances. Both the drainage impact and the walkways fees have not been updated for a very long time and the existing fees do not reflect the current costs of constructing walkways and drainage facilities.

Recommendation

Introduce Ordinances 583 and 584 and continue to May 26th for the second reading of the ordinances.

Attachment

1. Ordinances 583, 584
2. Seifel Consulting Inc. nexus studies on the Drainage and Walkways Impact Fees dated March 2009.
3. Minutes of the March 23rd City Council meeting

BEFORE THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LAFAYETTE
IN THE MATTER OF:

An Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Lafayette Amending Chapter 8-1 of the Lafayette Municipal Code Relating to Walkways Impact Fees	)))	Ordinance No. 583

WHEREAS, under California Constitution, Art. XI, Section 7, the City of Lafayette (the "City") has police power to impose conditions on development projects; and under California Government Code Sections 66000, et seq., the City may, by ordinance, impose a fee, such as a walkways impact fee, on any project for the purpose of defraying all or a portion of the cost of public facilities related to the development project as a condition of development;

WHEREAS, the City adopted its current walkways impact fee of $50.00 per dwelling unit in 1969, for the purpose of providing a comprehensive system of walkways, curbs and gutters in the City, has not updated it since that time, and desires to do so now to more accurately reflect the City's costs of providing that service (the "Walkways Impact Fee");

WHEREAS, in 1999 the City adopted a Master Walkways Plan, and revised it in 2006 ("the Master Walkways Plan"), the goal of which is to create a comprehensive system of walkways that afford safe and efficient pedestrian movement along roads and streets having significant foot and vehicular traffic, and that connect residential areas with public transportation, schools, community amenities, parks, City and regional trail systems, and the downtown;

WHEREAS, the purpose of the Walkways Impact Fee is to allow the City to generate sufficient revenue to meet the demand for walkways facilities and infrastructure generated by new residential development; ensure that existing walkways infrastructure will not become overburdened; and ensure that future development will bear its fair-share responsibility for the walkways system;

WHEREAS, the Walkways Impact Fee will be assessed on new residential development in the City because new residential development increases residential population which creates a corresponding increase in the use of the existing walkways facilities, and in the demand for additional walkways facilities, and will be differentiated among residential unit types to reflect the differences in walkways need each residential unit type is likely to generate;

WHEREAS, the Walkways Impact Fee will not be assessed on new commercial development because the majority of the walkways system is in residential areas, and all new non-residential development shall be required to mitigate its impacts on the walkways system as a condition of approval set forth by the Planning Commission or City Council;

WHEREAS, the City has estimated the total cost of the walkways improvements and facilities needed to accommodate future residential population identified in the Master Walkways Plan and has determined the proportion of those costs attributable to future resident population by determining the difference between the existing residential household population and the projected future residential population at buildout in 2030; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Government Code Section 66016 et seq., the City has: (1) made available to the public at least ten days prior to its public hearing, data supporting the reasonableness of the Walkways Impact Fee; (2) mailed notice at least fourteen days prior to the public hearing to all interested parties who have requested notice of new or increased fees; (3) published notice two times in a newspaper of general circulation at least ten days prior to the public hearing; and (4) held a duly noticed, regularly scheduled, public hearing at which oral and written testimony were received regarding the proposed Walkways Impact Fee.

WHEREAS, all other legal prerequisites to the adoption of this Ordinance have occurred.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LAFAYETTE DOES ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The City Council of the City of Lafayette hereby approves the Walkways Impact Fee Report prepared by Seifel Consulting, Inc. for the City of Lafayette, dated March 2009 (the "Walkways Impact Fee Report"), as well as the facilities and estimated costs identified in the Master Walkways Plan for the City of Lafayette dated June 28, 1999, and revised February 27, 2006 (the "Master Walkways Plan.") The Walkways Impact Fee Report and the Master Walkways Plan are hereby incorporated by this reference for the purposes of supporting the findings below pursuant to California Government Code Section 66001, and further substantiating the Walkways Impact Fee.

Section 2. Findings. Pursuant to California Government Code Section 66001, et seq. the City Council hereby finds and determines as follows with respect to the Walkways Impact Fees:

a. The above recitals are true, correct, adopted by the City Council as if its own.

b. The Walkway Impact Fee Report and Master Walkways Plan satisfy the requirements of Government Code Section 66001, because they: (1) identify the purpose of the Walkways Impact Fee; (2) identify the use to which the Walkways Impact Fee will be put and the facilities for which the Fee is charged; (3) identify how the need for the Fee and the Fee's use bear a reasonable relationship to the type of development project on which the Fee is imposed; and (4) demonstrate that there is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the Walkways Impact Fee imposed on new development and the cost of walkways facilities attributable to new development.

Section 3. Amendments.

Section 8-113 of the Lafayette Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"8-113 Requirements before acting upon applications for permits.

(a) The city shall not issue a land use, variance or building permit which requires installation of any frontage improvements, nor approve any major or minor subdivision or site plan and building elevations application which requires installation of any frontage improvements, until it first determines that such frontage improvements are consistent with the adopted Master Walkways Plan.

(b) Except as to building permits for construction, remodeling or alterations having a value as estimated by the city of less than 50 percent of the assessed value of the land and improvements on the current assessment roll, and to the extent permitted by law, the agency of the city acting upon application or request for a land use permit, variance, major or minor subdivision, site plan and building elevations approval, change in land use or building permit, which does not include frontage improvements in the application, shall impose upon the application or owner as a condition of granting it:

(1) The conveyance to the city of land necessary for the required frontage improvements; and

(2) The construction at the owner's expense of abutting frontage improvements described in the Master Walkways Plan; or

(3) The contribution in cash of a sum equal to the cost of construction of frontage improvements, had the same been required under subsection (b)(2) above (as estimated by the city), (to the frontage improvements trust account for that street on which the improvements are required.)

(c) A frontage improvement trust account shall be established for each street for which there is an approved highway or drainage plan. The balance in such account shall be used to defray part of the cost of the planned frontage improvements at the time they are constructed by the city. If an assessment district is formed at the time the improvements are actually constructed, the lot or lots originally contributing to such account shall receive credit for the amounts contributed against the benefit assessment made against those lots.

(d) In addition to the foregoing, a walkways impact fee shall be levied per dwelling unit on all new residential

development , as more fully described in Article 4 of this chapter. The standards and formula for setting the walkways impact fee shall be set forth by resolution of the city council."

Article 4, of Chapter 8-1entitled Walkways Impact Fee, and containing Sections 8-131 is hereby added to the Lafayette Municipal Code to read as follows:

"Article 4. Walkways Impact Fee

8-131 Authority.

This article is adopted under Government Code Sections 66000 et seq., and the city's general police power.

8-132 Compliance with Master Walkways Plan.

The walkways facilities for which the payment of a walkways impact fee is required shall be in accordance with the Masters Walkways Plan and in furtherance of the circulation element of the city general plan.

8-133 Supplemental regulations.

The city council shall adopt regulations to establish fees, administration, procedures, implementation, interpretation and policy considered necessary or desirable to carry out this chapter by resolution.

8-134 Definitions.

In this chapter, unless the context otherwise requires:

"New residential development" means and includes construction of, or an addition of 120 square feet of habitable space to, a residential structure or facility.

"Master Walkways Plan" means the City of Lafayette Master Walkways Plan, adopted June 28, 1999 Appendices Revised February 27, 2006.

"Walkways" and "walkways facilities" mean any path intended primarily for pedestrian use that parallels or is directly associated with any street or road, and include sidewalks and all other improved pedestrian rights-of-way whose principal purpose is to provide suitable separation between vehicular and pedestrian traffic.

"Walkways program costs" means the total cost of infrastructure facilities that the city anticipates will be needed to meet the needs of existing and future users, and includes the costs for walkways facilities and infrastructure as identified in the Masters Walkway Plan and the costs for that portion of the Aqueduct Trail, a regional multi-modal trail, designed for pedestrian use.

"Walkways system" means the comprehensive system of walkways designed to afford safe and efficient pedestrian movement along roads and streets having significant foot and vehicular traffic, and to connect residential areas with public transportation, schools, community amenities, parks, city and regional trail systems, and the downtown as described in the Walkways Master Plan.

8-135 Fee Imposed – Amount.

A person who applies for a permit for new residential development shall pay to the city a walkways impact fee based upon the of the new development in an amount established by resolution of the city council.

8-136 Time of payment.

(a) The walkways impact fee shall be paid to the city before a person may begin new residential development. If the

new residential development requires a building permit or grading permit, the walkways impact fee shall be paid before issuance of the permit. Neither a Contra Costa County nor a city official may issue a building or grading permit until the required fee is paid.

8-137 Creation of Fund; fund administration and disposition of proceeds.

(a) The proceeds from the walkways impact fee and interest collected under this chapter shall be used only for the purposes of upgrading or expanding walkways facilities identified in the Master Walkways Plan as a result of demand on the walkways system created by new residential development, and studies related to the same.

(b) All walkways impact fees paid under this chapter and interest earned thereon shall be accounted for in a separate walkways fund by the city manager and held by the city only for the above-described purposes until committed by the city.

(b) The city may advance money from its general fund to pay the cost of walkways system maintenance and expansion necessitated by new development and reimburse the general fund for such advances from the walkways fund.

8-138 Administration fee.

An administration fee shall be charged to cover the administration costs associated with the walkways impact fee program. The administration fee shall be paid in conjunction, and at the same time, with the payment of fees as provided in this chapter. This administration fee shall be established by resolution of the city council.

8-139 Refund.

The walkways impact fee paid under this chapter shall be refunded on application of the fee payer if the payer shows to the satisfaction of the planning director that the new development did not occur and that the building permit is canceled, surrendered or expired.

8-140 Refunds of uncommitted walkways impact fees.

(a) Walkways impact fees collected under this chapter shall be committed within five years after the payment of such fees or the issuance of building permits on one-half of the lots created by a subdivision, whichever occurs later. If such fees are not committed, such uncommitted funds shall be distributed among the then record owners of the subdivision in the same proportion that the size of their lot bears to the total area of all lots within the subdivision. For the purpose of this chapter, "committed" means that the fees have been encumbered by contract, conveyed, paid or allocated through the city council's adoption of a budget, for an identified walkways project or activity within the scope of Section 8-135.

(b) Except when administrative costs of refunding the unexpended revenues exceed the amount to be refunded, when sufficient funds have been collected as provided for in the Mitigation Fee Act, Section 66006(b)(1)(F) of the Government Code, to complete financing on incomplete city walkways facilities and the walkways facilities remain incomplete, the city shall identify, within 180 days of the determination that sufficient funds have been collected, an approximate date by which the acquisition and installation of the walkways facilities will be commenced, or shall refund to the then current record owner or owners of the lots or units, as identified on the last equalized assessment roll, of the development project or projects on a prorated basis, the unexpended portion of the walkways impact fee, and any interest accrued thereon.

8-141 Exemptions.

(a) A permit to rebuild a dwelling unit damaged or destroyed by act of God, fire or other natural disaster, is exempt from this chapter if the permit to rebuild is applied for by the owner within one year of the damage or destruction caused by the natural disaster. If the habitable area of the new unit exceeds that of the unit destroyed or damaged, then the owner shall pay the fee as if the increased area were an addition.

(b) This chapter does not apply to commercial or industrial subdivisions; nor does it apply to condominium projects or stock cooperatives which consist of the subdivision of airspace in an existing apartment building if that building is more than five years old and no new dwelling units are added.

(c) No fee is required for additions to residences of less than 120 square feet of habitable space."

Section 4. CEQA. The City Council finds that pursuant to Section 21080(b)(8) of the Public Resources Code, the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") is not applicable this Ordinance because the establishment, modification, structuring, restructuring, or approval of rates, tolls, fares, and other charges by this Ordinance are for the purpose of obtaining funds for capital projects, necessary to maintain service within existing service areas and/or service areas within the City.

Section 5. Notice of Exemption. The City Council directs staff to prepare and file a Notice of Exemption no more than five (5) working days after adoption of this Ordinance.

Section 6. Effective Date. This Ordinance becomes effective s thirty (30) days after its adoption.

Section 7. Severability. If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this Ordinance, or any part thereof is for any reason held to be unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not effect the validity or effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Ordinance or any part thereof. The City Council hereby declares that it would have passed each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this Ordinance irrespective of the fact that one or more sections, subsections, subdivision, paragraphs, sentences, clauses or phrases be declared unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective. To this end the provisions of this Ordinance are declared to be severable.

Section 8. Publication. The City Clerk shall either (a) have this Ordinance published in a newspaper of general circulation once within fifteen (15) days after its adoption, or (b) have a summary of this Ordinance published twice in a newspaper of general circulation, once five (5) days before its adoption and again within fifteen (15) days after adoption.

The foregoing Ordinance was introduced at a meeting of the City Council of the City of Lafayette held on May 11, 2009 and was adopted and ordered published at a meeting of the City Council held on May 26, 2009 by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT:

ATTEST:

Joanne Robbins, City Clerk

APPROVED:

Don Tatzin, Mayor

BEFORE THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LAFAYETTE
IN THE MATTER OF:

An Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Lafayette Amending Chapter 8-17 of the Lafayette Municipal Code Relating to Drainage Impact Fees	)))	Ordinance No. 584

WHEREAS, under California Constitution, Art. XI, Section 7, the City of Lafayette (the "City") has police power to impose conditions on development projects, and under California Government Code Sections 66000, et seq., the City may, by ordinance, impose a fee such as a drainage impact fee, on any project for the purpose of defraying all or a portion of the cost of public facilities related to the development project as a condition of development;

WHEREAS, the City adopted its current drainage impact fee of $0.10/square foot for any increase in the total impervious surface area attributable to new residential and commercial development, including expansions to new development (the "Current Drainage Impact Fee"), in 1985 for the purpose of funding a Citywide drainage study that would identify the drainage facilities needed to support existing and future new development (the "Drainage Master Plan"), and has not updated it since that time;

WHEREAS, the Drainage Master Plan, completed in 1998, identified and documented a list of proposed projects and their estimated costs needed to support existing and future new development in Lafayette;

WHEREAS, subsequent analyses by City staff have refined the list of proposed storm drainage projects and costs, with the most current list, the Master CIP Storm Drain Priority Report (the "Storm Drain Priority Report"), having been completed in April 2007;

WHEREAS, existing City drainage capacity cannot adequately accommodate the demand of anticipated development within the City, and in order to offset the impact of such development on the City's drainage system, drainage fees should be revised as identified in this Ordinance (the "Revised Drainage Impact Fee");

WHEREAS, the Revised Drainage Impact Fee will: (1) fund the City's continued efforts to update the Drainage Master Plan to better support the storm drainage needs of existing and new development and ensure that existing drainage infrastructure will not become overburdened; and (2) fund the costs of constructing the improvements identified in the Storm Drain Priority Report so that the City can provide and maintain a comprehensive system of drainage infrastructure and facilities to meet the additional demand on the system created by new development, and ensure that existing drainage facilities do not become overburdened;

WHEREAS, the Revised Drainage Impact Fee will be assessed on new and expanded development that adds impervious surface because drainage infrastructure needed for storm drainage is a function of land area and the larger the impervious surface created, the greater the demand for drainage facilities to manage runoff;

WHEREAS, pursuant to Government Code Section 66016 et seq., the City has: (1) made available to the public at least ten days prior to its public hearing, data supporting the reasonableness of the Revised Drainage Impact Fee; (2) mailed notice at least fourteen days prior to the public hearing to all interested parties who have requested notice of new or increased fees; (3) published notice two times in a newspaper of general circulation at least ten days prior to the public hearing; and (4) held a duly noticed, regularly scheduled, public hearing at which oral and written testimony were received regarding the Revised Drainage Impact Fee; and

WHEREAS, all other legal prerequisites to the adoption of this Ordinance have occurred.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LAFAYETTE DOES ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The City Council of the City of Lafayette hereby approves the Drainage Impact Fee Report prepared by Siefel Consulting, Inc. the City of Lafayette, dated March 2009 (the "Drainage Impact Fee Report"), as well as the facilities and cost estimates identified in the Drainage Master Plan, dated _December 1998, (the "Drainage Master

Plan"), and the Master CIP Storm Drain Priority Report, dated, April 17, 2007 (the "Storm Drain Priority Report.") The Drainage Impact Fee Report, Drainage Master Plan, and Storm Drain Priority Report are hereby incorporated by this reference for the purpose of supporting the below findings pursuant to California Government Code Section 66001, and further substantiating the Revised Drainage Impact Fee.

Section 2. Findings. Pursuant to California Government Code Section 66000 et seq., the City Council hereby finds and determines as follows with respect to the Revised Drainage Impact Fees:

a. The above recitals are true and correct and adopted by the City Council as if its own; and

b. The Drainage Impact Fee Report, Drainage Master Plan, and Storm Drain Priority Report satisfy the requirements of Government Code Section 66001, because they: (1) identify the purpose of the Revised Drainage Impact Fee; (2) identify the use to which the Revised Drainage Impact Fee will be put and the facilities for which the Fee is charged; (3) identify how the need for the Revised Drainage Impact Fee and the Fee's use bear a reasonable relationship to the type of development project on which the Fee is imposed; and (4) demonstrate that there is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the Revised Drainage Impact Fee imposed on new development and the cost of drainage facilities attributable to new development;

Section 3. Amendments.

Section 8-1701 through 8-1707 of the Lafayette Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"8-1702 Definitions.

In this chapter, unless the context otherwise requires:

(a) "Drainage system" means and includes watershed areas and improved and unimproved drainageways in the city. The term "drainage system" is broadly based and may include areas and facilities which are private or under the jurisdiction of the Contra Costa County flood control district for which the city is not legally responsible.

(b) "Drainage system study" means a survey and mapping of the existing drainage system, development of a master drainage plan and an evaluation of: the present capacity of the system; the state of repair of improvements; the capacity and facilities needed to accommodate drainage in the future; and the potential impact of new development on erosion. A study may be done in phases.

(c) "Drainage program costs" means and includes the total cost of infrastructure facilities that the City anticipates would be needed to meet the needs of existing and future users as identified in the city's most current Storm Drain Priority Report and estimated future costs not yet contemplated by the Storm Drain Priority Report, including additional infrastructure and annual inspections.

(d) "New development" means and includes construction of or an addition to a residential or commercial structure or facility, including a driveway, parking area, sports court or swimming pool, or any other construction which may affect the area of impervious surface of the land.

8-1703 Fee imposed--Amount.

A person who applies for a permit for new development shall pay to the city a drainage impact fee based upon the proposed increase in impervious surface of the new development in an amount established by resolution of the city council.

8-1704 Time of payment.

The drainage impact fee shall be paid to the city before a person may begin new development. If the new development requires a building permit or grading permit, the drainage fee shall be paid before issuance of the permit. Neither a Contra Costa County nor a city official may issue a building or grading permit until the required

fee is paid.

8-1705 Exemptions.

The drainage impact fee is not required if the proposed new development:

(a) Is to replace a structure if the proposed structure has the same as or less impervious surface than the original structure;

(b) Is located within Contra Costa County Flood Control District drainage area 15 or proposed drainage areas 46 or 67;

(c) Involves an increase of impervious surface of less than 100 square feet; or

(d) Rebuilds a dwelling unit damaged or destroyed by act of God, fire or other natural disaster, if the permit to rebuild is applied for by the owner within one year of the damage or destruction caused by the natural disaster. If the impervious surface area of the new unit exceeds that of the unit destroyed or damaged, then the owner shall pay the fee as if the increased area were an addition.

(e) This chapter does not apply to commercial or industrial subdivisions; nor does it apply to condominium projects or stock cooperatives, which consist of the subdivision of airspace in an existing apartment building if that building is more than five years old and no new dwelling units are added.

8-1706 Creation of fund; fund administration and disposition of proceeds.

(a) There is created a fund entitled "drainage impact fund." The proceeds from the drainage impact fee and interest collected under this chapter shall be paid only into this fund and shall be accounted for by the city manager until committed by the city.

(b) The drainage impact fund shall be used only for the purpose of defraying the cost of improving currently-existing drainage facilities and infrastructure and designing and constructing future drainage facilities and infrastructure pursuant to the most current Drainage Master Plan and Storm Drain Priority Report, as a result of the demand on the system created by new development, and studies related to the same.

(b) The city may advance money from its general fund to pay the cost of drainage system maintenance and expansion necessitated by new development and reimburse the general fund for such advances from the drainage impact fund.

8-1707 Refund.

The fee paid under this chapter shall be refunded on application of the fee payer if the payer shows to the satisfaction of the planning director that the new development did not occur and that the building permit is canceled, surrendered or expired.

8-1708 Refunds of uncommitted drainage impact fees.

(a) Drainage impact fees collected under this chapter shall be committed within five years after the payment of such fees or the issuance of building permits on one-half of the lots created by a subdivision, whichever occurs later. If such fees are not committed, such uncommitted funds shall be distributed among the then record owners of the subdivision in the same proportion that the size of their lot bears to the total area of all lots within the subdivision. For the purpose of this chapter, "committed" means that the fees have been encumbered by contract, conveyed, paid or allocated through the city council's adoption of a budget, for an identified drainage project or activity within the scope of Section 8-1706.

(b) Except when administrative costs of refunding the unexpended revenues exceed the amount to be refunded, when sufficient funds have been collected as provided for in the Mitigation Fee Act, Section 66006(b)(1)(F) of the Government Code, to complete financing on incomplete city drainage facilities and the drainage facilities remain incomplete, the city shall identify, within 180 days of the determination that sufficient funds have been collected, an approximate date by which the acquisition and installation of the drainage facilities will be commenced, or shall refund to the then current record owner or owners of the lots or units, as identified on the last equalized assessment roll, of the development project or projects on a prorated basis, the unexpended portion of the drainage impact fee, and any interest accrued thereon.

8-1709 Supplemental regulations.

The city council shall adopt regulations to establish fees, administration, procedures, implementation, interpretation and policy considered necessary or desirable to carry out this chapter by resolution.

8-1710 Standards and formula for calculation.

The standards and formula for setting the drainage impact fee shall be set forth by resolution.

8-1711 Administration fee.

An administration fee shall be charged to cover the costs associated with administering the drainage impact fee program. The administration fee shall be paid in conjunction, and at the same time, with the payment of fees as provided in this chapter. This administration fee shall be established by resolution of the city council."

Section 4. CEQA. The City Council finds that pursuant to Section 21080(b)(8) of the Public Resources Code, the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") is not applicable this Ordinance because the establishment, modification, structuring, restructuring, or approval of rates, tolls, fares, and other charges by this Ordinance are for the purpose of obtaining funds for capital projects, necessary to maintain service within existing service areas and/or service areas within the City.

Section 5. Notice of Exemption. The City Council directs staff to prepare and file a Notice of Exemption no more than five (5) working days after adoption of this Ordinance.

Section 6. Effective Date. This Ordinance becomes effective thirty (30) days after its adoption.

Section 7. Severability. If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this Ordinance, or any part thereof is for any reason held to be unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not effect the validity or effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Ordinance or any part thereof. The City Council hereby declares that it would have passed each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this Ordinance irrespective of the fact that one or more sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, sentences, clauses or phrases be declared unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective. To this end the provisions of this Ordinance are declared to be severable.

Section 8. Publication. The City Clerk shall either (a) have this Ordinance published in a newspaper of general circulation once within fifteen (15) days after its adoption, or (b) have a summary of this Ordinance published twice in a newspaper of general circulation, once five (5) days before its adoption and again within fifteen (15) days after adoption.

The foregoing Ordinance was introduced at a meeting of the City Council of the City of Lafayette held on May 11, 2009 and was adopted and ordered published at a meeting of the City Council held on May 26, 2009 by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:

ABSTAIN:
ABSENT:

ATTEST:

Joanne Robbins, City Clerk

APPROVED:

Don Tatzin, Mayor

REPORT

Walkways Impact Fee Report

Prepared for:

City of Lafayette

March 2009

Seifel
CONSULTING INC.

221 Main Street
Suite 420
San Francisco CA
94105

415.618.0700
fax 415.618.0707
www.seifel.com

Table of Contents
City of Lafayette
Walkways Impact Fee Report

I. Introduction I-1

A. Report Organization I-1

B. Overview of Legislative Requirements I-1

C. Caveats I-2

II. Background and Purpose of the Walkways Fee II-1

A. Relationship between the Walkways Fee, Master Walkways Plan and Demographic and Land Use Data II-1

B. Type of Development on Which Fee Are Imposed II-2

C. Calculation Methodology for Walkways Fee II-3

III. Update of the Walkways Fee III-1

A. Projections of New Development III-1

B. Allocation of Walkways Fee Program Costs III-3

C. Proposed FY 2009/10 Base Walkways Fee III-4

IV. Administrative Costs for the Walkways Fee Program IV-1

A. Types of Development Impact Fee Administrative Activity IV-1

B. Administrative Costs IV-1

V. Summary of Walkways Fee V-1

VI. Methodology for Updates to Walkways Fee VI-1

A. Annual Updates VI-1

B. Comprehensive Updates VI-1

Table of Contents
City of Lafayette
Walkways Impact Fee Report (cont.)

Table of Tables

Table III-1 Projected New Residential Units from 2008 through 2030 ..... III-1
Table III-2 Projected Additional Residential Population from 2008 through 2030 ..... III-2
Table III-3 Existing and Buildout Household Residential Population III-2
Table III-4 Walkways Improvement Costs III-3
Table III-5 Allocation of Walkways Improvement Costs to Existing and New Development III-4
Table III-6 Proposed FY 2009/10 Base Walkways Fee per User III-5
Table III-7 Proposed FY 2009/10 Base Walkways Fee by Dwelling Unit Type III-5
Table V-1 Total Proposed FY 2009/10 Walkways Fee V-1

Appendices

Appendix Table 1 Projected New Residential Units from 2008 through 2030
Appendix Table 2 Construction Cost Index (CCI) 1998 through 2008

I. Introduction

This report presents the facts and reasoning supporting the FY 2009/10 update to the City of Lafayette's Walkways Impact Fee (Walkways Fee). The Walkways Fee will allow the City to provide walkways facilities and infrastructure to meet the demand generated by new residential development.

The report builds upon the City's existing Walkways Fee, established in 1969. This report presents updates to the existing Walkways Fee, including the establishment of a nexus for the Walkways Fee. The updated Walkways Fee, a development impact fee, will support the provision of needed walkways for the City's comprehensive public walkways system. The updated fee would be adopted under the authority allowed by AB 1600, the "Mitigation Fee Act."

A. Report Organization

This report presents the background supporting the update to the City's Walkways Fee. It also summarizes the purpose of the fee, describes the methodology for how the fee is calculated, presents the proposed fee amounts, and discusses how the fee will be updated in the future. Following the introductory chapter of this report, the remaining chapters and appendices of this report are organized as follows:

- Chapter II discusses the proposed update to the Walkways Fee, including background information, the determination of the relationship (or nexus) between new development and the need for providing walkways and the calculation of the fee.
- Chapter III presents the data used in the Walkways Fee calculation, including demographic, land use and walkways improvement cost data.
- Chapter IV provides an explanation of the administrative costs included in the Walkways Fee.
- Chapter V summarizes the total Walkways Fee, including the administrative costs.
- Chapter VI discusses the methodology for updates to the Walkways Fee, including annual updates.
- The appendix provides the background residential development data and the index used for the annual update of the Walkways Fee.

B. Overview of Legislative Requirements

Lafayette is considering an update to the Walkways Fee, a development impact fee, which the city may charge under the authority of the Government Code and pursuant to its police power. Sections 66000 et seq. of the Government Code establishes procedures for development impact Fee. This legislation (enacted as AB 1600) requires a local agency that establishes, increases, or imposes a development impact fee as a condition of development after January 1, 1989 to do the following:

1. Identify the purpose of each impact fee;
2. Describe the use or improvements for which the fee will be used; and

3. Demonstrate a reasonable relationship (or nexus) between:
   - The need for the public improvements and the type of new development which will benefit from them, and
   - The amount of the fee, which reflects the proportional cost of the public improvement and facility attributable to the new development on which the fee is imposed.

C. Caveats

The data and analysis presented in this report has been gathered from the most reliable sources available to the City and Seifel Consulting Inc. (Seifel). This information has been assembled for the sole purpose of establishing a reasonable estimate of the Walkways Fee. Some of the numbers presented in tables within this report may not exactly calculate due to computer rounding.

II. Background and Purpose of the Walkways Fee

Lafayette's Walkways Fee was established in 1969 for the purpose of providing a comprehensive walkways system of walkways, curbs and gutters in the City. The City adopted a Master Walkways Plan (Walkways Plan) in 1999, and in 2006, revised the list of priority walkways improvements needed to support existing and future new development in Lafayette. Currently, the City charges a $50 per dwelling unit Walkways Fee to all residential development (new construction, remodeling or alteration) that meets a minimum valuation requirement.[1]

Since the initial fee adoption, the City has not updated the Walkways Fee. Therefore, the purpose of updating the Lafayette's Walkways Fee is to establish a nexus between the construction and provision of walkways improvements identified in the 2006 revision of the Walkways Plan. The updated Walkways Fee would more accurately reflect the cost to the City to provide walkways facilities to the City, and help ensure that the City maintain a comprehensive system of walkways infrastructure and facilities to meet the additional demand created by new development. The fee will also ensure that existing walkways infrastructure will not become overburdened, and future development will bear its fair-share responsibility for the walkways system.

A. Relationship between the Walkways Fee, Master Walkways Plan and Demographic and Land Use Data

As discussed in the Walkways Plan, the goal of the Walkways Plan is to create a system of safe walkways that promote efficient pedestrian movement. Once completed, the City's network of walkways will connect residential areas with public transportation, schools, community amenities, parks, City and regional trail systems, and the downtown.

Lafayette's Walkways Plan documents the relationship, or nexus, between new development and the provision of a comprehensive system of walkways within the City. The rationale for the nexus is that increases in residential population from new development in Lafayette create a corresponding increase in use or demand of Lafayette's walkways system. The update to the Walkways Fee is based on the premise that new residential development should pay its proportionate share of the walkways improvements needed to accommodate new growth.

New commercial development will be required to mitigate any impacts on the walkways system caused by new development either through the provision of new walkways improvements or equivalent contribution to the citywide walkways system.

The updated Walkways Fee, which fairly allocates the fee between existing and new development, is based on the most currently available demographic and land use data, needed walkways improvements identified in the Walkways Plans, and the costs to provide the identified walkways improvements.

---

[1] Per Section 8-113 of the Lafayette Municipal Code, residential construction estimated by the city of more than "50 percent of the assessed value of the land and improvements on the current assessment roll" is subject to the $50/dwelling unit Walkways Fee.

1. Demographic and Land Use Data

Demographic data is essential in apportioning the costs of needed walkways improvements between existing and future residents. For the purpose of this analysis, existing development is defined as development built on or before December 31, 2007. Future development is development occurring from January 1, 2008 forward. For planning and forecasting purposes, the Lafayette Planning Department defines buildout of the City to occur in 2030.

The Walkways Fee is calculated using baseline statistics for existing and projected residential population. "Residential population" is the measure of total household population in Lafayette. Demographic statistics for population in the City in 2008 (as of January 1, 2008) and 2030 are used to calculate current and projected residential populations.[2] The current household population estimate is based on data from the California Department of Finance. Projections of population growth from 2008 and 2030 are based on estimates of new population generated by new residential development in the City during this period.

The City's General Plan and Housing Element provide the necessary land use data to project new residential development.

2. Walkways Fee Program Improvements

The listed walkways improvements in the Walkways Plan and associated costs provided by City staff are also required to fairly allocate the proposed Walkways Fee. As the Walkways Plan describes, the City's walkways system is intended to connect residential areas with recreational, civic and commercial areas within Lafayette. The identified walkways improvements and cost of the improvements, combined with demographic and land use data, therefore, provide the foundation for the computation of the updated Walkways Fee.

B. Type of Development on Which Fee Are Imposed

The Walkways Fee will be assessed on new residential development in Lafayette that will result in an increase in the resident population, thus increasing the demand by new residents for walkways facilities.[3] The proposed fee schedule is differentiated among residential land use types to reflect the differences in facility need among types of new development, based on the number of new residents each residential unit type is likely to generate. The need resulting from residential development is based on the number of new residents living in new units, as indicated in the most recent U.S. Census and reflected in Section 6-1615 of the Lafayette Municipal Code.

The City will levy the Walkways Fee on the following types of residential land uses, as described in the Lafayette Municipal Code:

- **Single Family Detached**: A dwelling including one and only one kitchen, designed for occupancy as a residence of one family, located on a single lot of its own, and surrounded on all sides by yard space.

---

[2] The California Department of Finance (DOF) has not yet estimated the 2009 population for cities. Therefore, for this analysis, future population and development are benchmarked to January 1, 2008 for consistency.

[3] The Walkways Fee cannot be used to address existing deficiencies to walkways serving current residents.

- **Single Family Attached, Duplex**: A dwelling including one and only one kitchen, designed for occupancy as a residence of one family, located on a single lot of its own, but not surrounded on all sides by yard space.
- **Apartment/Condominium**: A separate suite, including kitchen facilities, designed for and occupied as the home, residence or sleeping place of one or more persons living as a single housekeeping unit. A condominium consists of an undivided interest in common in a portion of real property coupled with a separate interest in space called a unit, the boundaries of which are described on a recorded final map, parcel map, or condominium plan in sufficient detail to locate all boundaries thereof.
- **Mobile Home**: Units certified under the National Mobile Home Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974, and any subsequent revisions thereto, and confirming to the requirements of Section 6-527 of the Lafayette Municipal Code.
- **Secondary Unit**: An attached or detached residential dwelling unit that provides complete independent living facilities for one or more persons, as provided for in Section 6-560 of the Lafayette Municipal Code. It shall include permanent provisions for living, sleeping, eating, cooking and sanitation on the same parcel as the primary unit is situated.

C. Calculation Methodology for Walkways Fee

In order to determine the Walkways Fee amount to be charged to new development, the City must determine the baseline condition (existing residential household population) and the total projected new residential population from new development on vacant and underutilized land. The difference between the two reflects the foreseeable amount of new development on which impact fees may be levied.

The process for determining the nexus between the impacts stemming from new development and amount of the fee imposed involves the following steps:

Step 1 **Project new residential development.** The updated Walkways Fee will be levied on new residential development. New residential development is estimated based on development potential on the City's vacant and underdeveloped land.

Step 2 **Project future residential population, based on new residential development and the persons per household by dwelling unit type.** New residents from future development will utilize Lafayette's walkways system. The population generated from new residential development is dependent on the type of dwelling unit. Single family detached units, for example, typically have more residents than multifamily units. Therefore, a persons per household multiplier must be applied to the projected number of new residential units by dwelling unit type to determine the total number residents from new development.

Step 3 **Determine the distribution of existing and future residential population, based on the projected total population at buildout.** New development will only be responsible for its fair share of the improvements identified Walkways Plan. The distribution of existing and future residents will determine the percentage of the walkways costs to be borne by new residential development.

Step 4 **Estimate the total cost of walkways improvements.** The total cost of walkways improvements is based on the improvements identified in the Walkways Plan

Step 5 **Allocate the fair share of total walkways costs to new development.** Based on Steps 2 and 3 above determine the portion of total walkways costs attributable to new development.

Step 6 **Calculate a base fee per user.** The portion of walkways costs to be borne by new development is divided by the total number of projected new residents (determined in Step 1), to calculate the base fee per user.

Step 7 **Determine fee for each new development type.** Based on the projected new residential development (Step 1), the persons per household factor by dwelling unit type (from Step 2), and the base fee per user (Step 6), a fee by dwelling unit type can be determined.

Each of the steps above is illustrated below with the data used to calculate the updated Walkways Fee. The fee calculation methodology allocates the total walkways impact fee program costs across all development, including existing and future, new development that would occur through the City's buildout, anticipated to occur in 2030. This methodology fairly allocates the proposed Walkways Fee between existing and future new development.

III. Update of the Walkways Fee

A. Projections of New Development

1. Projected New Residential Units

The City's General Plan and Housing Element provide information on the residential buildout potential on the City's vacant and underdeveloped land as of 2002. Based on recent development trends and the City's General Plan, 1,120 additional new units are projected to be constructed in Lafayette from 2008 through the City's project buildout in 2030, as shown in Table III-1. Appendix Table 1 details existing development as of 2002 and annual construction from 2003 through 2007.

As indicated in Section II.A, future development is considered development that occurs after January 1, 2008, in order to maintain consistency with the most current population data. The City reported a net construction of six units (four single family detached and two second units) in 2008. As the effect of including these six units in the fee calculation would be minimal, this report utilizes residential construction data through 2007 for fee calculation purposes.

Table III-1
Projected New Residential Units from 2008 through 2030[a]

Residential (units)[b]	Projected New Units 2008-2030
Single Family Detached	255
Single Family Attached, or Duplex	154
Apartments, Three or More Units	547
Mobile Home	0
Subtotal Non-Second Units	*956*
Second Units[c]	164
Total Units:	**1,120**

a. Based on City of Lafayette General Plan, October 2002. Second units estimated by City staff based on existing building permit data. See Appendix Table A-1 for more details.

b. Single Family Detached includes units projected in areas zoned for rural and low density single family. Single Family Attached includes units projected in areas zoned for medium density single family. Apartments include units projected in areas zoned multifamily and non-residential.

c. New second units estimated by City staff and assumes the construction of eight second units per year from 2008 through 2030.

Source: City of Lafayette General Plan, Planning Department.

2. Projected Future Residential Household Population

Based on the City's projected new housing units, Lafayette's projected future residential household population can be estimated by taking into account housing vacancy and the persons per unit multiplier as presented in Section 6-1615 of the Lafayette Municipal Code. The projected future resident population, or new users of the City's walkways system, is summarized in Table III-2.

Table III-2
Projected Additional Residential Population from 2008 through 2030

	Total New Units 2008-2030	Occupied Units at Buildout[a]	Persons/ Dwelling Unit[b]	Projected Additional Household Population 2008-2030
Single Family Detached	255	250	2.794	699
Single Family Attached, or Duplex	154	151	1.940	293
Apartments, Three or More Units	547	536	1.689	906
Mobile Home	0	0	1.650	0
Second Unit	164	161	1.000	161
Total:	**1,120**	**1,098**		**2,058**

a. Assumes 1.95% vacancy rate for Lafayette per the California Department of Finance (DOF).

b. Per Municipal Code 6-1615, based on 2000 US Census of population in occupied housing units.

Source: City of Lafayette, California Department of Finance, US Census 2000.

a. Distribution of Existing and Future Residential Population

New residential development will be responsible for its fair share of walkways improvements as identified in the Walkways Plan. The distribution of existing and future household residents is calculated to determine the fair share of costs attributable to new residential development. As shown in Table III-3, approximately eight percent of the City's total population at buildout will be generated by future residential development between 2008 through 2030.

Table III-3
Existing and Buildout Household Residential Population

	Existing 2008[a]	From New Development 2008-2030	Total at Buildout
Residential Population	23,826	2,058	25,884
Share of Resident Population at Buildout	92.0%	8.0%	100.0%

a. Residential household population estimated by DOF as of January 1, 2008.

Source: City of Lafayette, DOF.

B. Allocation of Walkways Fee Program Costs

1. Walkways Fee Program Costs

The Walkways Fee Program includes the total cost of infrastructure facilities that the City anticipates would be needed to meet the needs of existing and future users. It includes the cost for walkways facilities and infrastructure as identified in the 2006 revision of the Walkways Plan. The Walkways Fee Program also includes the Aqueduct Trail, a regional multi-modal trail, which is designed for both pedestrian and bicycle uses.[4] The Walkways Fee Program costs are summarized in Table III-4.

Table III-4
Walkways Improvement Costs

	Estimated Cost (FY 2008/09 Dollars)[a]
Master Walkways Plan Projects	$6,990,000
Aqueduct Trail	$7,450,000
% of Aqueduct Trail as Walkway[b]	40%
Walkway Portion of Aqueduct Trail	$2,980,000
Walkways Improvement Costs	**$9,970,000**

a. Costs rounded to the nearest ten thousand.

b. Estimate based on the width of Aqueduct Trail anticipated for pedestrian use.

Source: City of Lafayette, Seifel Consulting Inc.

2. Allocation Methodology

Table III-5 uses the calculated percentage share of new resident population from new development to fairly allocate the total cost of walkways improvements within the Walkways Fee Program. Future new residential development will be responsible for eight percent of total walkway improvement costs.

[4] Only the portion of the Aqueduct Trail anticipated for pedestrian use is included in the Walkways Fee Program.

Table III-5
Allocation of Walkways Improvement Costs to Existing and New Development

	Allocated Share of Cost[a]	Cost Allocation (FY 2008/09 Dollars)[b]
Master Walkways Plan		
For Existing Residential Population	92.0%	$6,430,000
For New Residential Population	8.0%	$560,000
Total	100.0%	$6,990,000
Aqueduct Trail		
For Existing Residential Population	92.0%	$2,740,000
For New Residential Population	8.0%	$240,000
Total	100.0%	$2,980,000
Total Walkways Improvement Costs		
For Existing Residential Population	92.0%	$9,170,000
For New Residential Population	8.0%	$800,000
Total	100.0%	$9,970,000

a. Refer to Table 3.

b. Rounded to the nearest ten thousand.

Source: City of Lafayette, Seifel Consulting Inc.

C. Proposed FY 2009/10 Base Walkways Fee

As the Walkways Fee calculation methodology in Section III.A demonstrates, the proposed updated Walkways Fee is calculated based on the percentage share of the total cost of walkways improvements, according to the distribution of existing and future resident population. This methodology allocates the cost of the City's walkways system fairly among existing and future residential development.

1. Base Fee per User

Table III-6 shows the proposed base Walkways Fee per user based on the cost allocation attributable to the new users and the projected number of new users estimated from new residential development from 2008 through 2030.

Table III-6
Proposed FY 2009/10 Base Walkways Fee per User

	Master Walkways Plan	Aqueduct Trail	Base Fee
Cost Allocation to New Users	$560,000	$240,000	$800,000
New Users from 2008 - 2030	2,058	2,058	2,058
Base Fee per User[a]	**$272**	**$117**	**$389**

a. Base Fee per User rounded to the nearest dollar.

Source: City of Lafayette, Seifel Consulting Inc.

2. Base Fee by Dwelling Unit

The base fee by dwelling unit is determined with the persons per household multiplier and the base fee per user, as calculated in Table III-6. Table III-7 presents the base fee by dwelling unit type.

Table III-7
Proposed FY 2009/10 Base Walkways Fee by Dwelling Unit Type[a]

	Persons/ Household	Base Fee
Base Fee per User		*$389*
Single Family Detached	2.794	$1,087
Single Family Attached, or Duplex	1.940	$755
Apartments, Three or More Units	1.689	$657
Mobile Home	1.650	$642
Second Unit	1.000	$389

a. Base Fee by Dwelling Unit Type rounded to the nearest dollar.

Source: City of Lafayette, Seifel Consulting Inc.

IV. Administrative Costs for the Walkways Fee Program

The administration of the Walkways Fee program will require a variety of activities that will involve additional costs to the program that must be accounted for in the total Fee. The type and amount of these costs are described below.

A. Types of Development Impact Fee Administrative Activity

Three types of administrative activity and costs are associated with the Walkways Fee Program.

- Project Specific
- General Administration
- Comprehensive Updates

Project Specific

Project specific activities relate to a development project in the city planning or building permit review process for which the applicant has requested an adjustment to their impact fee assessment. This request for fee adjustment can either be an informal or formal process for which the applicant pays all associated costs. This review process is cost recoverable and is not included in any Walkways Fee administrative cost calculations.

General Administration

Ongoing efforts necessary to administer the Walkways Fee program are considered relevant staff activities under the general administration category. These work efforts include annual reviews and adjustments, staff training, legislative reporting requirements, financial or program monitoring and analysis, and response to requests for and maintenance of information.

Comprehensive Updates

The comprehensive updates of the fee program are periodic reviews, which involve in-depth analysis necessary to fairly balance the burden of costs attributable to new and existing development. This detailed analysis and subsequent establishment of fee levels maintains equity in the Walkways Fee program. Activities related to the comprehensive updates include reviews of the methodology used to calculate the Walkways Fee, updates of project costs, amendments to the program, and updates to land use and demographic data.

B. Administrative Costs

Lafayette's administrative costs for the Walkways Fee program are estimated at approximately five percent of the base Walkways Fee. The administrative cost estimate is based on City staff's experience from administering the City's existing Fee program. As the actual cost of administration is determined through assessment of the program, this administrative assessment may be adjusted to better reflect the real cost of administration, should it differ significantly from the five percent estimate. The administrative cost amount will be assessed in addition to the base Walkways Fee.

V. Summary of Walkways Fee

Table V-1 shows the total Walkways Fee, including the Walkways Fee and Administrative Costs for the Walkways Fee Program. The calculation of the total Walkways Fee adds five percent of the base fee to cover administrative costs of the fee program. As the Walkways Fee is updated and assessed over time, this administrative assessment may be adjusted to reflect costs of administration of the fee program, should they differ from the five percent estimate. This fee is the final proposed Walkways Fee to be assessed on new development.

Table V-1
Total Proposed FY 2009/10 Walkways Fee
City of Lafayette

	Base Fee	Administrative Costs[a]	Total Fee
Single Family Detached	$1,087	$54	$1,141
Single Family Attached, or Duplex	$755	$38	$793
Apartments, Three or More Units	$657	$33	$690
Mobile Home	$642	$32	$674
Second Unit	$389	$19	$408

a. Administrative costs estimated at five percent of base fee by dwelling unit type. Rounded to the nearest dollar.

Source: City of Lafayette, Seifel Consulting Inc.

VI. Methodology for Updates to Walkways Fee

A. Annual Updates

The Walkways Fee should be updated annually in order to keep pace with inflation of construction costs in the San Francisco Bay Area. To this end, the Walkways Fee would be indexed to changes in the prior year's Construction Cost Index (CCI), published for the Bay Area by Engineering News-Record (ENR). For example, the FY 2010/11 update to the Walkways Fee will increase the fee by difference in the average annual CCI for 2008 and 2009, as published by ENR in December of each year. As Appendix Table 2 demonstrates, the average annual increase in the CCI over the past 10 years was 3.6 percent.

B. Comprehensive Updates

Every five to seven years, the City should also undertake a comprehensive update of the Walkways Fee program to allow for greater flexibility in addressing program changes. The comprehensive updates would allow the City to refine land use, improvement costs, and other assumptions used in this report to reflect changes over time.

Appendix

Projected Residential New Development 2008 through 2030

Index Used for Walkways Fee Update

Appendix Table 1
Projected New Residential Units from 2008 through 2030
City of Lafayette

	Potential New Units at 2030[a]	Less: Net Annual Construction[b]					Total New Units at Buildout Less: 2003-2007 Construction
		2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	
Residential (units)[c]							
Single Family Detached	297	8	1	17	3	13	255
Single Family Attached, or Duplex	154						154
Apartments, Three or More Units	556		9				547
Mobile Home	0						0
Subtotal Non-Second Units	*1,007*	*8*	*10*	*17*	*3*	*13*	*956*
Second Units[d]	176		1	3	4	4	164
Total Units:	**1,183**	**8**	**11**	**20**	**7**	**17**	**1,120**

a. Based on City of Lafayette General Plan, October 2002. Second units estimated by City staff based on existing building permit data.
existing building permit data.

b. Includes the 38 units that were demolished between 2003 through 2007.

c. Single Family Detached includes units projected in areas zoned for rural and low density single family. Single Family Attached includes units projected in areas zoned for medium density single family. Apartments include units projected in areas zoned multifamily and non-residential.

d. New second units estimated by City staff and assumes the construction of eight second units per year from 2008 through 2030.

Source: City of Lafayette General Plan, Planning Department.

Appendix Table 2
Construction Cost Index (CCI)[a]
1998 through 2008
San Francisco Bay Area

Year	December CCI	Annual Growth
1998	6,845.59	1.7%
1999	6,816.70	-0.4%
2000	7,447.99	9.3%
2001	7,399.07	-0.7%
2002	7,644.46	3.3%
2003	7,788.80	1.9%
2004	8,228.39	5.6%
2005	8,462.45	2.8%
2006	9,108.66	7.6%
2007	9,131.80	0.3%
2008	9,781.67	7.1%
Average Annual Growth (1998 - 2008)		3.6%

a. Engineering News-Record (ENR) reports its annual CCI as of December of each year.

Source: Engineering News-Record.

REPORT

Drainage Impact Fee Report

Prepared for:

City of Lafayette

March 2009

Seifel
CONSULTING INC

221 Main Street
Suite 420
San Francisco CA
94105

415.618.0700
fax 415.618.0707
www.seifel.com

Table of Contents
City of Lafayette
Drainage Impact Fee Report

I. Introduction I-1

A. Report Organization I-1

B. Overview of Legislative Requirements I-1

C. Caveats I-2

II. Update of the Drainage Fee II-1

A. Background and Purpose of the Drainage Fee II-1

B. Relationship between the Drainage Fee, Land Use Data and Drainage Master Plan II-1

C. Type of Development on Which Fee Are Imposed II-3

D. Calculation of Drainage Fee II-3

E. Proposed FY 2009/10 Base Drainage Fee II-8

III. Administrative Costs for the Drainage Fee Program III-1

A. Types of Development Impact Fee Administrative Activity III-1

B. Administrative Costs III-1

IV. Summary of Drainage Fee IV-1

V. Methodology for Updates to Drainage Fee V-1

A. Annual Updates V-1

B. Comprehensive Updates V-1

Table of Contents
City of Lafayette
Drainage Impact Fee Report (cont.)

Table of Tables

Table II-1 Summary of Developable Land by Land Use II-4
Table II-2 Summary of Impervious Surface Ratio from Building Permit and Development Plans II-5
Table II-3 Adjusted Impervious Surface Area to Lot Area Ratio II-6
Table II-4 Summary of Impervious Surface Ratio by Land Use through 2030 ..... II-7
Table II-5 Costs for Drainage Fee Program II-8
Table II-6 Proposed FY 2009/10 Base Drainage Fee II-8
Table IV-1 Total Proposed FY 2009/2010 Drainage Fee IV-1

Appendices

Appendix A: Drainage Projects in the Drainage Fee Program
Appendix B: Index Used for Drainage Fee Update

I. Introduction

This report presents the facts and reasoning supporting the FY 2009/10 update to the City of Lafayette's Drainage Impact Fee (Drainage Fee). The Drainage Fee will allow the City to provide drainage facilities and infrastructure to meet the demand generated by new residential and commercial development.

The report builds upon the City's existing Drainage Fee, established in 1985. This report presents updates to the existing Drainage Fee, including the establishment of a new nexus for the Drainage Fee. The updated Drainage Fee, a development impact fee, will support the provision of needed drainage for the City's public drainage system. The updated fee would be adopted under the authority allowed by AB 1600, the "Mitigation Fee Act."

A. Report Organization

This report presents the background supporting the update to the City's Drainage Fee. It also summarizes the purpose of the fee, describes the methodology for how the fee is calculated, presents the proposed fee amounts, and discusses how the fee will be updated in the future. Following the introductory chapter of this report, the remaining chapters and appendices of this report are organized as follows:

- Chapter II discusses the proposed update to the Drainage Fee, including background information, the determination of the relationship (or nexus) between new development and the need for providing drainage and the calculation of the fee
- Chapter III provides an explanation of the administrative costs included in the Drainage Fee.
- Chapter IV summarizes the total Drainage Fee, including the administrative costs.
- Chapter V discusses the methodology for annual updates to the Drainage Fee.
- Appendix A details the current drainage projects included in the Drainage Fee program.
- Appendix B provides the index used for the annual update of the Drainage Fee.

B. Overview of Legislative Requirements

Lafayette is considering an update to the Drainage Fee, a development impact fee, which the city may charge under the authority of the Government Code and pursuant to its police power. Sections 66000 et seq. of the Government Code establishes procedures for development impact Fee. This legislation (enacted as AB 1600) requires a local agency that establishes, increases, or imposes a development impact fee as a condition of development after January 1, 1989 to do the following:

1. Identify the purpose of each impact fee;
2. Describe the use or improvements for which the fee will be used; and

3. Demonstrate a reasonable relationship (or nexus) between:
   - The need for the public improvements and the type of new development which will benefit from them, and
   - The amount of the fee, which reflects the proportional cost of the public improvement and facility attributable to the new development on which the fee is imposed.

C. Caveats

The data and analysis presented in this report has been gathered from the most reliable sources available to the City and Seifel Consulting Inc. (Seifel). This information has been assembled for the sole purpose of establishing a reasonable estimate of the Drainage Fee. Some of the numbers presented in tables within this report may not exactly calculate due to computer rounding.

II. Update of the Drainage Fee

A. Background and Purpose of the Drainage Fee

Lafayette's Drainage Fee was established in 1985 for the purpose of funding a Drainage Master Plan, a citywide drainage study that would identify the drainage facilities needed to support existing and future new development in Lafayette. Currently, the Drainage Fee is charged to new development at a rate of $0.10/SF for any increase in the total impervious surface area attributable to new residential and commercial development, including expansions to existing development.[1]

The Drainage Master Plan, completed in 1998, identified and documented a list of proposed projects and their estimated costs needed to support existing and future development in Lafayette. Subsequent analyses by City staff have refined the list of proposed storm drainage projects and costs. The most current list, the Master CIP Storm Drain Priority Report (Storm Drain Priority Report), was updated in April 2007.

The purpose of updating the Lafayette's Drainage Fee is twofold. First, the City intends to continue its efforts to update the Drainage Master Plan in order to better support the storm drainage needs of existing and new development. Second, based on the improvements identified in the Storm Drain Priority Report, the updated Drainage Fee would establish a nexus between the construction and provision of new drainage facilities and expansions to existing facilities to allow for more intense usage of the Lafayette's citywide drainage system by future residents and employees.

The updated Drainage Fee would more accurately reflect the cost to the City to provide drainage facilities to the City, and help ensure that the City maintain a comprehensive system of drainage infrastructure and facilities to meet the additional demand created by new development. The fee will also ensure that existing drainage infrastructure will not become overburdened, and future development will bear its fair-share responsibility for the drainage system.

B. Relationship between the Drainage Fee, Land Use Data and Drainage Master Plan

Lafayette's Drainage Master Plan, and associated Storm Drain Priority Report, documents the relationship, or nexus, between new development and the provision of new drainage facilities. The rationale for the nexus is that increases in impervious surface to land area attributable to new development in Lafayette create a corresponding increase in the demand for drainage facilities.

---

[1] New development is defined in Section 8-1702 of Lafayette's Municipal Code as the "construction of or an addition to a residential or commercial structure or facility, including a driveway, parking area, sports court or swimming pool, or any other construction, which may affect the area of impervious surface of the land."

Drainage infrastructure needed for storm drainage is a function of land area and the permeability of land. When stormwater falls to the ground, permeable surfaces have the capacity to absorb water while impervious surfaces do not allow water to infiltrate into the ground, creating greater amounts of runoff than permeable surfaces. The larger the impervious surface created, the greater the need for improvements to the drainage system to manage runoff.

Future development of impervious surface diminishes the capacity of the existing drainage system to serve existing users, unless the capacity of the drainage system is expanded. Therefore, the capacity of the system needs to be increased to maintain the level of service provided to existing development and to meet the demand created by new development. The capacity of the system can be expanded by the installation of new and/or the intensification of existing drainage facilities and infrastructure so that they can accommodate the impact borne by additional impervious surface created by new or intensified development.

Calculation of an updated Drainage Fee, which fairly allocates the fee between existing and new development, relies on land use data, identified drainage improvements and the costs to provide the identified drainage improvements.

1. Drainage Fee and Land Use Data

Land use data is essential to computing the updated Drainage Fee. As Section E describes in more detail, the total cost of the drainage impact fee program is allocated to existing and new development based on the average amount of impervious surface area generated by each land use. Land use data from the City's General Plan provide information about the amount of developable land in the City, defined as the total land area that has been developed or will be developed in the future.

Furthermore, due to development standards, land use categories generally exhibit an average proportion or ratio of impervious surface area to lot area, based on the particular land use. For example, residential land uses typically have a small ratio of impervious surface area to lot area, given setback and building footprint requirements. Commercial land uses, on the other hand, typically include parking and smaller setbacks that result in a larger ratio of impervious surface area to lot area. Understanding the relationship between the average impervious surface coverage by land use and the total developable land area within the City is essential to calculating the updated Drainage Fee.

2. Drainage Fee and Storm Drain Infrastructure and Cost Data

The listed improvements and costs identified in the Storm Drain Priority Report are also required to fairly allocate the proposed Drainage Fee. As the Drainage Master Plan describes, the facilities identified in the Storm Drain Priority Report are intended to serve existing and future development. The identified drainage improvements and cost of the improvements from the Storm Drain Priority Report, combined with land use data, therefore, provide the foundation for the computation of the updated Drainage Fee.

C. Type of Development on Which Fee Are Imposed

Any new residential or commercial development that adds impervious surface would be charged the proposed updated Drainage Fee. Intensification of parcels that have already been developed would be charged based on the net new impervious surface area that is added.

The following section describes the calculation of the proposed updated Drainage Fee.

D. Calculation of Drainage Fee

The formula for calculating the Proposed Drainage Fee is as follows:

Drainage Fee = **Total Drainage Impact Fee Program Costs**
Divided by
Total square feet of developable land by land use
Multiplied by
Percent impervious surface by land use (Impervious Surface Ratio)

The above formula allocates the total drainage impact fee program costs across all development, including existing development and new development that would occur through the City's buildout, anticipated to occur in 2030. This formula fairly allocates the proposed Drainage Fee between existing and future new development.

Total Square Feet of Developable Land	Total square feet of developable residential and commercial land
Impervious Surface Ratio	The typical percentage or ratio of impervious surface to total lot size by land use
Total Drainage Fee Program Cost	Cost for drainage infrastructure and facilities, as defined by the Storm Drain Priority Report and projected future drainage infrastructure costs

Each of these factors is discussed below.

1. Total Square Feet of Developable Land

The City's General Plan presents the total developable land in Lafayette by land use categories. The total developable land includes areas already developed as well as areas that will be developed and redeveloped in the future. Table II-1 summarizes the developable land by land use categories.

Table II-1
Summary of Developable Land by Land Use

Land Use Designation	Total Developable Land (Acres)	Total Developable Land (SF)	Percent of Total
Residential			
Rural Residential	1,629.2	70,968,000	21.2%
Low Density Single Family Residential	3,630.1	158,127,000	47.3%
Medium Density Single Family Residential	2,057.0	89,603,000	26.8%
Low Density Multifamily Residential	53.7	2,339,000	0.7%
High Density Multifamily Residential	58.7	2,557,000	0.8%
Subtotal Residential	***7,428.7***	***323,594,000***	***96.8%***
Commercial			
West End Commercial	38.8	1,690,000	0.5%
East End Commercial	82.3	3,585,000	1.1%
Downtown Core	79.3	3,454,000	1.0%
Subtotal Commercial	***200.4***	***8,729,000***	***2.6%***
Mixed Use			
Multifamily Residential/Office	43.4	1,891,000	0.6%
Subtotal Mixed Use	***43.4***	***1,891,000***	***0.6%***
Total	**7,672.5**	**334,214,000**	100.0%

Note: Developable square footage of land rounded to the nearest thousand.

Source: Contra Costa County Building Inspection Department, City of Lafayette General Plan, Seifel Consulting Inc.

The City's developable land represents the total area that would generate impervious surfaces and impact the City's drainage system.

2. Impervious Surface Ratio by Land Use

As discussed above, a fee based on new impervious surface area added provides a clear nexus between the proposed Drainage Fee and new development's impact on drainage infrastructure. The ratio of impervious surface area to lot area created by development is expected to vary across land uses, based on lot size, building setback, parking, and other zoning requirements. Understanding the typical amount of impervious surface generated by residential and commercial land use categories is needed in order to fairly allocate the cost of identified drainage improvements among land uses.

Table II-2 summarizes the ratio of impervious surface area to lot area by land use types, based on building permit records from 2005 through 2007 and recent development plans.

Table II-2
Summary of Impervious Surface Ratio from Building Permit and Development Plans[a]

	Number of Lots	Total Lot Area Reported	Total Impervious Surface Reported	Average Lot Area	Average Impervious Surface/ Unit[a]	Percent Impervious Surface of Average Lot[b]
Residential						
Single Family						
Rural Density	3	1,694,200	13,684	564,733	4,561	0.8%
Low Density	16	1,892,206	72,465	118,263	4,529	3.8%
Medium Density	56	1,318,451	186,124	23,544	3,324	14.1%
Multifamily						
Low Density[c]	27	120,797	70,388	4,474	2,607	58.3%
High Density[d]	74	129,586	81,801	1,751	1,105	63.1%
Commercial[e]		70,123	63,044			89.9%
Mixed Use[f]		25,700	23,114			89.9%

a. Based on building permit information from Contra Costa County for new single family residential units, second units and residential additions from 2005 through 2007, as well as building permit records/development plans for recently completed or proposed multifamily and commercial developments from 2002 to present.
b. Rounded to the nearest percent.
c. Includes Lafayette Park Terrace, Meritage Oaks and 3607 Bickerstaff.
d. Includes Chestnut Street and Woodbury multifamily residential developments.
e. Includes the Plaza Point Building and Lafayette Mercantile and excludes Sinai Memorial Chapel.
f. Includes the Lafayette Mixed Use Project.

Source: Contra Costa County Building Inspection Department, City of Lafayette, Seifel Consulting Inc.

As shown in Table II-2, within residential land uses categories, lower density residential uses are less impervious than higher density residential uses. This is primarily due to the average parcel size of residential lots. Compared with residential land uses, commercial and mixed uses, typically found in the City's downtown, exhibit a higher percentage of impervious surface.

a. Adjustments to Impervious Surface Development

In 1999, the California Regional Water Quality Control Board for the San Francisco Bay Region reissued waster discharge requirements under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). The new requirements call for additional onsite treatment controls to limit stormwater pollutant discharges associated with certain new development and intensification of existing development in order to comply and implement the region's Stormwater Management Plan.

City staff estimate that the effect of this regulation would result in a ten percent reduction in the ratio of impervious surface area to lot area for all land uses. The adjusted ratio of impervious surface to lot area is shown in Table II-3.

Table II-3
Adjusted Impervious Surface Area to Lot Area Ratio

	Percent Impervious Surface of Average Lot[a]	Adjusted % Impervious Surface of Average Lot[b]	Adjusted % Impervious Surface of Average Lot (rounded)
Residential			
Single Family			
Rural Density	0.8%	0.7%	1.0%
Low Density	3.8%	3.4%	3.0%
Medium Density	14.1%	12.7%	13.0%
Multifamily			
Low Density	58.3%	52.5%	53.0%
High Density	63.1%	56.8%	57.0%
Commercial	89.9%	80.9%	81.0%
Mixed Use	89.9%	80.9%	81.0%

a. See Table II-2.

b. Includes a 10 percent adjustement on the ratio of impervious surface area to lot area to account for revised standards for water discharge from the California Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Source: Contra Costa County Building Inspection Department, City of Lafayette, Seifel Consulting Inc.

Applying the rounded adjusted ratio of impervious surface area to lot area to the total development land yields the total square feet of impervious surface by land use categories expected at the City's buildout, projected to occur in 2030. Table II-4 summarizes the total impervious surface expected to be developed through 2030, by residential and commercial land use categories.

Table II-4
Summary of Impervious Surface Ratio by Land Use through 2030

Land Use Designation	Total Developable Land (Acres)	Total Developable Land (SF)	Adjusted % Impervious Surface of Average Lot[a]	SF of Impervious Surface[b]
Residential				
Rural Residential	1,629.2	70,968,000	1.0%	710,000
Low Density Single Family Residential	3,630.1	158,127,000	3.0%	4,744,000
Medium Density Single Family Residential	2,057.0	89,603,000	13.0%	11,648,000
Low Density Multifamily Residential	53.7	2,339,000	53.0%	1,240,000
High Density Multifamily Residential	58.7	2,557,000	57.0%	1,457,000
Subtotal Residential	***7,428.7***	***323,594,000***		***19,799,000***
Commercial				0.0%
West End Commercial	38.8	1,690,000	81.0%	1,369,000
East End Commercial	82.3	3,585,000	81.0%	2,904,000
Downtown Core	79.3	3,454,000	81.0%	2,798,000
Subtotal Commercial	***200.4***	***8,729,000***		***7,070,000***
Mixed Use				0.0%
Multifamily Residential/Office	43.4	1,891,000	81.0%	1,532,000
Subtotal Mixed Use	***43.4***	***1,891,000***		***1,532,000***
Total	**7,672.5**	**334,214,000**		**28,401,000**

a. See Table II-3.

b. Rounded to the nearest thousand.

Source: Contra Costa County Building Inspection Department, City of Lafayette General Plan, Seifel Consulting Inc.

b. Data Considerations for Impervious Surface Ratio

Due to little recent development activity, only a few data points were available to calculate the impervious surface ratio for some land uses. For instance, rural density and low density multifamily residential developments are calculated based on recent development of three parcels each. Commercial development and high density multifamily development is based on two developments each, and mixed used development is based solely on the Lafayette Mixed Use project, containing a self storage, retail and residential component.

While the availability of data is limited by development activity, City staff is confident that these data points represent the type of development and intensity of impervious surface area generated that the City will see in the future, and therefore the data used to determine the impervious surface ratio by land use is an adequate basis for the fee calculation for the proposed updated Drainage Fee.

3. Drainage Fee Program Costs

The Drainage Fee Program includes the total cost of infrastructure facilities that the City anticipates would be needed to meet the needs of existing and future users. It includes the cost for drainage facilities and infrastructure as identified in the City's most current Storm Drain Priority Report and estimated future costs not yet contemplated by the Storm Drain Priority Report, including additional infrastructure and annual inspections. The Drainage Fee Program costs are summarized in Table II-5.

Table II-5
Costs for Drainage Fee Program

	Estimated Costs (in FY 06/07 Dollars)	Estimated Cost (in FY 08/09 Dollars)[a]
Drainage Infrastructure and Facilities[b]	$11,940,000	$12,820,000
Future Drainage Infrastructure and Facilities[c]	$2,240,000	$2,400,000
Total	**$14,180,000**	**$15,220,000**

a. Escalated by 3.6 percent annually from FY 2006/07 dollars, based on the average annual growth rate from 1998 through 2008 calculated from the Engineering News-Record's Construction Cost Index (CCI) for the San Francisco Bay Area. See Appendix B-1. Cost rounded to the nearest ten thousand.
b. Detailed in the April 2007 Storm Drain Priority Report in Appendix A.
c. Estimated at ten percent of $18 million road reconstruction projects, plus $440,000 for 22 annual video inspections from FY 2008/09 to buildout, in 2030.

Source: City of Lafayette, Seifel Consulting Inc.

E. Proposed FY 2009/10 Base Drainage Fee

As the Drainage Fee calculation methodology in Section II.D demonstrates, the proposed updated Drainage Fee is calculated based on the total cost of drainage facilities needed through 2030 divided by the total estimated development of impervious surface through 2030. This methodology allocates the cost of the City's drainage system fairly among existing and future development. Furthermore, the proposed Drainage Fee will be assessed only on net new impervious surface added, ensuring that the costs to be borne by future new development are fairly distributed.

Table II-6 shows the proposed FY 2009/10 Base Drainage Fee. The proposed fee would be levied on all new residential and commercial development.

Table II-6
Proposed FY 2009/10 Base Drainage Fee
City of Lafayette

Total Drainage Program Costs	$15,220,000
Total Impervious Surface at Buildout (SF)	28,401,000
Base Drainage Fee/SF of Impervious Surface	$0.54

Source: City of Lafayette, Seifel Consulting Inc.

III. Administrative Costs for the Drainage Fee Program

The administration of the Drainage Fee program will require a variety of activities that will involve additional costs to the program that must be accounted for in the total Fee. The type and amount of these costs are described below.

A. Types of Development Impact Fee Administrative Activity

Three types of administrative activity and costs are associated with the Drainage Fee Program.

- Project Specific
- General Administration
- Comprehensive Updates

Project Specific

Project specific activities relate to a development project in the city planning or building permit review process for which the applicant has requested an adjustment to their impact fee assessment. This request for fee adjustment can either be an informal or formal process for which the applicant pays all associated costs. This review process is cost recoverable and is not included in any Drainage Fee administrative cost calculations.

General Administration

Ongoing efforts necessary to administer the Drainage Fee program are considered relevant staff activities under the general administration category. These work efforts include annual reviews and adjustments, staff training, legislative reporting requirements, financial or program monitoring and analysis, and response to requests for and maintenance of information.

Comprehensive Updates

The comprehensive updates of the fee program are periodic reviews, which involve in-depth analysis necessary to fairly balance the burden of costs attributable to new and existing development. This detailed analysis and subsequent establishment of fee levels maintains equity in the Drainage Fee program. Activities related to the comprehensive updates include reviews of the methodology used to calculate the Drainage Fee, updates of project costs, amendments to the program, refined forecasts for land use and financial data, and reviews of facility requirements.

B. Administrative Costs

Lafayette's administrative costs for the Drainage Fee program are estimated at approximately five percent of the base Drainage Fee. The administrative cost estimate is based on City staff's experience from administering the City's existing Fee program. As the actual cost of administration is determined through assessment of the program, this administrative assessment may be adjusted to better reflect the real cost of administration, should it differ significantly from the five percent estimate.

This amount will be assessed in addition to the base Drainage fee, to cover costs of administration. For a typical single family detached dwelling unit with 4,500 SF of new impervious surface added, the administrative cost portion of the Drainage Fee would be approximately $128 (five percent of $2,565), comparable to the administrative cost the City collects on other development fees.

IV. Summary of Drainage Fee

Table IV-1 shows the total Drainage Fee, including the Drainage Fee and Administrative Costs for the Drainage Fee Program. The calculation of the total Drainage Fee adds five percent of the base fee to cover administrative costs of the fee program, as previously described. As the Drainage Fee is updated and assessed over time, this administrative assessment may be adjusted to reflect costs of administration of the fee program, should they differ from the five percent estimate. This fee is the final proposed Drainage Fee to be assessed on new impervious surface added by new development.

Table IV-1
Total Proposed FY 2009/2010 Drainage Fee
City of Lafayette

Base Drainage Fee/SF of New Impervious Surface	$0.54
Administrative Costs[a]	$0.03
Total Drainage Fee/SF of Impervious Surface	**$0.57**

a. Administrative costs estimated at five percent of the Base Drainage Fee per square foot of new impervious surface added.

Source: City of Lafayette, Seifel Consulting Inc.

V. Methodology for Updates to Drainage Fee

A. Annual Updates

The Drainage Fee should be updated annually in order to keep pace with inflation of construction costs in the San Francisco Bay Area. To this end, the Drainage Fee would be indexed to changes in the prior year's Construction Cost Index (CCI), published for the Bay Area by Engineering News-Record. For example, the FY 2010/11 update to the Walkways Fee will increase the fee by difference in the average annual CCI for 2008 and 2009, as published by ENR in December of each year. As Appendix Table B-1 demonstrates, the average annual increase in the CCI over the past 10 years was 3.6 percent.

B. Comprehensive Updates

Every five to seven years, the City should also undertake a comprehensive update of the Drainage Fee program to allow for greater flexibility in addressing program changes. The comprehensive updates would allow the City to refine land use, improvement costs, and other assumptions used in this report to reflect changes over time.

Appendix A:

Drainage Projects in the Drainage Fee Program

Master CIP Storm Drain Priority Report

Priority A-1

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
	Springhill Rd Drainage Improvements, Brown Ave. to Blackhawk Rd	Replace open ditch with closed pipe	Covering ditch will provide better shoulder support and pavement deterioration of pavement	Pipes: RP8ii, RP8jj3, RP8jj2, RP8ll, RP8mm, RP8nn	96-145	$160,000

Summary for Priority A-1 (1 project)

Sum	$160,000
Percent	0.49%

Priority A-2

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
2002	Carlyle Terr. Drainage Improvements	Stabilize storm drain outfalls	Street runoff may be causing erosion and slope instability on private property.	Pipe #'s: TP27a1, TP27a2. TV'd, ok in 2005.	96-156	
2008	Estates Dr	Selective slope stabilization, shoulder widening, guardrails, and culvert replacement	Existing pavement is deteriorated; unstable shoulders cause pavement to deteriorate and may lead to unsafe driving conditions; edge of road needs better delineation	Pipe #'s: LP20y, LP20a, LP20b, LP20c, LP20d, LP20e, LP20f, LP20g	96- 33	$500,000
	Miller Dr. Storm Drain	Replace 15" CMP pipes totalling 300 ft. in length with larger facility.	15" CMP pipes are under capacity and beginning to rust through.	Pipe #'s: TP46b, TP46c. Pipes ok 5/02.	98-104	$60,000

Summary for Priority A-2 (3 projects)

Sum	$560,000
Percent	1.72%

Priority B-1

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
	Pleasant Hill Rd. 126" CMP Replacment	Additional Creek backwater analysis needed to determine replacement or lining of existing 500-ft. long 126" CMP.	Appears under capacity.	Pipe #'s: RC14L1, RC14L2, RC14M, RC14O1, RC14O2	98-101	$600,000

Priority B-1

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
Summary for Priority B-1 (1 project)						
Sum						$600,000
Percent						1.84%

Priority B-2

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
	Chestnut St/Walnut St Drainage	Install 500' of storm drain in each street, connect to the storm drain in Dewing Ave (Project 96-20)	Neighborhood lacks drainage facilities, causing flooding of private property and deterioration of pavement shoulder	Pipe #'s: LP42d, LP42h, LP42i, LP42g, LP42m2, LP42l1	96-247	$250,000
	Hastings Ct. Slide Repair	Reconstruct slope and/or install retaining wall	Unstable slope is causing street pavement to deteriorate, may impact private property below street		96- 44	$100,000
	Lafayette Creek Stabilization, Village Center to 500' East	Spot creek bank stabilization	Bank erosion threatens adjoining private property and walkway along Mt. Diablo Blvd.	Culverts: LP35j2, LC35, LP35v, LP35u and d/s creek banks	96- 54	$135,000
	Las Trampas Rd Storm Drain	Install storm drain from Reliez Station Rd to connect within existing culvert which discharges onto hillside below road	Runoff from road may be contributing to instability of hillside	Pipe #'s TP57n1, TP57w	96- 57	$110,000
	Legion Ct Storm Drain	Install new 15" RCP in Legion connecting to Acalanes Rd; abandon 12" CMP at westend of street, extend new pipe south to Hidden Valley Rd	Existing 12" CMP is deteriorated due to age	Pipe #: LP10l, LP10k; ok 2005.	96-243	$90,000
	Lindsey Ct. Storm Drain Replacement	Replacement of existing 150-ft. long 18" CMP	Flow line has lots of rust.	Pipe #: RP34a. Pipe ok in 02. Good liner project.	98-102	$30,000
	Los Palos Dr Storm Drain, Glenside Dr (N orth) to Los Palos Cir.	Install storm drain to intercept existing 24" RCP which discharges onto creek across private property	Creek is unimproved and may be inadequate to handle flows from public street	Private ditch, no easements	96- 62	$200,000
	Moraga Rd Drainage Improvements, Powell Dr to Via Granada	Install storm drain to intercept flows from culverts which discharge onto private property	Existing flows create flooding with unstable slope on private property below road	Pipe #'s: TP31b1, TP31b2, TP31k, TP31l, TP31m, TP31n, TP34a, TP32a2, TP32a1, TP32b	96- 83	$150,000
	Moraga Rd Drainage Improvements, Tanglewood Dr to Powell Dr	Install storm drain to intercept flows from culverts discharging onto private property	Discharge from culverts creates flooding on private property	Pipe #'s: TP 37a (18"CMP), TP37b (24"CMP), TP39a (27" x 18" CMP)	96- 88	$275,000

Priority B-2

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
	Mountain View Dr, Lafayette Creek Culvert Replacement	Replace existing 96" CMP with reinforced concrete box, Culvert ID# LC39	Existing CMP is undersized, causing flows to back-up and flow over road; pipe is also beginning to corrode	Need to be done in conjunction with downstream creek improvements. Condition ok 5/02.	96- 91	$130,000
	Old Jonas Hill Rd Drainage Improvements	Install pipe, stabilize creek as needed	Existing culverts and ditch are hydraulically inadequate	Pipe #'s: TP31i, TP31j, TP30a, TP34e, TP34f, TP34g, TP31p, TP31q, TP31d, TP31e, TP31f, TP3g	96-110	$220,000
	Reliez Valley Rd culvert crossing	Replace 230-ft. long 40" CMP storm drain after considering impact on D/S County facilities. Coordinate with County.	Existing 40" CMP is under capacity and flooding has occurred in this vicinity in past.	Pipe #: RPU2a	98-107	$92,000
	Silverado Dr. Storm Drain Replacement	Study backwater on existing 100 ft. long 90" CMP--need Creek modeling. Replace or line as warranted.	Under capacity.	SDM# GC15; ok 2002.	98-100	$160,000
	Silverwood Dr Storm Drain	Extend storm drain from existing 36" RCP at #50 upstream to existing 12" CMP at #87	Existing drainage system discharges onto private property, with potential for flooding and/or bank instability	Pipes: LP11b, LP11a, LP11d, LP11c, LP11f, LP11g , LP11h, LP11i, (Abandoning LP11k1 & LP11k2)	96-244	$90,000

Summary for Priority B-2 (14 projects)

Sum	$2,032,000
Percent	6.25%

Priority C-1

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
	Happy Valley Rd, Rose Ln to Palo Alto Dr	Extend storm drain westerly from Rose Ln to fill in open ditch; replace existing CMP culvert east of Franklin Ln	Existing open ditch is causing deterioration of pavement edge; existing culvert at Franklin Ln will ultimately require replacement due to age	Pipes: HP13a, HP13b, HP13d, HP13e, HP13f1; ok 6/98	96-224	$50,000
	Reliez Creek Stabilization @ Stanley Blvd.	Replace existing 72" CMP culvert with reinforced concrete box	Existing pipe is beginning to corrode. Pipe lined in 2003.	Pipe: RC16q	96-130	$100,000

Summary for Priority C-1 (2 projects)

Sum	$150,000
Percent	0.46%

Priority C-2

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
	Crest Dr Storm Drain	Extend 15"-18" RCP in Crest Dr 1200 ft. from Middle Rd to White Oak Dr	Existing driveway culverts are undersized; unimproved ditch is leading to collapse of pavement edge	Pipes #: LP4a, LP4f3 - all others are new	96-240	$240,000
	Monroe Ave. Reconstruction, First St. to Moraga Blvd.	Reconstruct pavement, replace curb & gutter, improve drainage	Existing pavement is in poor condition, curb and gutter has deteriorated and no longer conveys flows		96- 74	$400,000

Summary for Priority C-2 (2 projects)

Sum	$640,000
Percent	1.97%

Priority D-1

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
	Blackwood Ln Storm Drain, Highway 24 to Mt Diablo Blvd	Replace existing 24" CMP with 42" RCP	Capacity ok, condition ok 10/98	Pipe #'s: TP45dd, TP45cc, TP45bb, TP45aa, TP45oo	96-257	$150,000
	Happy Valley Highlands Drainage Study	Complete drainage study to determine best means of replacing existing CMP pipes and consolidate drainage courses on private property	Existing pipes will ultimately need replacement due to age; existing pipes discharge onto unimproved water courses on private property which may not be hydraulically adequate	Pipes: HP25a, HP25b, HP25c, HP25d, HP25e1, HP25e2, HP25f3, HP25f4, HP25f5	96-225	$20,000
	Hidden Valley Culvert Replacement	Replace existing 72" CMP culvert with new 72" RCP, or line invert of pipe	Existing culvert will ultimately require replacement due to age	Pipe # LC5, already lined; good 5/02.	96-241	$125,000
	Orchard Rd Storm Drain	Replace existing 12" CMP drain line from Orchard Rd along Ewartdale Ct and private property to Deer Hill Rd., ID#'s: HP31e2, HP31e1, 24" RCP's plotted correctly for HP31f,g,h	Existing 12" CMP may be undersized and deteriorated due to age	No capacity problems, pipes ok 10/96	96-228	$125,000
	Palo Alto Drive Culvert Replacement	Replace existing twin 72" CMP culvert (ID# HC9) with reinforced concrete culverts or box	Existing culverts OK now but will need replacement when CMP's are no longer structurally sound.	No capacity problems, pipe ok 5/02	96-220	$135,000
	Reliez Station Rd Storm Drain @ Pleasant Hill Rd	Replace existing 22"x123" CMPA with 15" RCP	Existing pipe is probably deteriorated due to age	Pipe: RP38b; ok 2005	96-232	$75,000

Priority D-1

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
	School St Storm Drain Replacement	Replace existing CMP drainage system with RCP	Existing system may be deteriorated due to age	Pipe #'s: TP28a, TP28b, TP28c, TP28d, TP28g, TP41i, TP41k, TP41n, TP41m, TP42a, TP42b, TP42c	96-251	$175,000
2009	Woodview Dr/Sweet Dr/Walnut Ln. Drainage Improvements	Replace existing CMP culverts; abandon culverts or ditches on private property where possible	Existing CMP is corroding; redesign of system may allow consolidation or better alignment of lows on private property	Pipe #'s: TP15c,TP15d,TP15e,TP15f1,TP15b3, TP17a,TP17b,TP17c,TP17d,TP17e,TP 17f,TP17g,TP17m,TP17k,TP17l,TP17 m2,TP18b,TP18c,TP18d,TP18e,TP18g ,TP18h,TP18i	96-169	$275,000

Summary for Priority D-1 (8 projects)

Sum	$1,080,000
Percent	3.32%

Priority D-2

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
	Acalanes Rd Storm Drain at Pidgeon Ct	Install 200' of 60" RCP to connect 60" cipp upstream with 60" RCP downstream	Existing 60" cipp discharges into open ditch on private property which may be hydraulically inadequate or unstable	Pipes #: LP14f, LP15i	96-242	$100,000
	Blackhawk Dr Culvert Repair	Replace or line culvert, stabilize entrance and exit, Pipe #RP6c	Creekbank at lower end of culvert requires stabilization to prevent impact to adjoining private property and road	ok as of 6/98	96- 06	$70,000
	Hawthorn Dr/Beechwood Dr Storm Drain, Phase II	Install new pipe in Hawthorn Dr from Beechwood Dr to Diablo Dr	Existing drainage ditch and driveway culverts are hydraulically inadequate	Pipe #'s: TP54l, TP54m, TP54i, TP54h, TP54o, TP54p2, TP54g, TP54c, TP54e, TP54f, TP54d, TP54b, TP54a	96-46	$220,000
	Helen Ave. Headwall and Storm Drain Repair	Reconstruct headwall, replace existing CMP under street	Existing headwall is collapsing, ok condition 9/98	Pipe #'s: TP9l, TP9o1, TP9o2, TP9o3, TP9m1, TP9m2, TP9n, TP9j, TP9k1	96- 48	$60,000
	Knox Dr Storm Drain, Chapel Dr to Hidden Valley Rd	Install 2000' of storm drain in Chapel Dr from 500' west of Knox Dr, and in Knox Dr downstream to Hidden Valley Rd; abandon existing pipes on private property	Existing CMP is probably deteriorated due to age, CMP appears to be located under buildings on church property; pipe downstream of Chapel Dr may be located on unstable bill	Pipe #'s: LP12a1, LP12a2, LP12b1, LP12b2, LP12c, LP12d, LP12e; ok 10/96	96-245	$200,000
	La Caminita Storm Drain Phase II	Replace exiting 36" CMP with 54" RCP; Pipe # RP11e	Existing pipe is deteriorated and hydraulically inadequate		96- 52	$165,000

Priority D-2

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
	Manzana Pl Storm Drain Replacement	Replace existing 8" CMP and open concrete ditch with 15" RCP	Existing 8" CMP appears to be undersized and is possibly deteriorated due to age	Pipe #: RP32e, ok 6/98	96-256	$40,000
	Martino Rd Drainage Improvements	Install pipe in intercept discharge from street onto private property	Existing system across private property is inadequate and has led to flooding of private property and erosion of channels	Pipe #s: RP8c, RP8b, RP8d, RP8f, RP8c, RP8x, RP8y; crossing at Greenbank is rusted thru	96- 68	$315,000
2008	Michael Ln.	Install storm drain to replace open ditch from Glenside Dr to Murray Ln	Existing ditch is hydraulically inadequate and plugged with debris during storms, causing flooding of adjoining property	Pipe #'s: TP20d, TP20e, TP20f, TP20m, TP20n	96- 73	$125,000
	Mountain View Dr Storm Drain, Mariposa to Upland	Install storm drain, intercept runoff from culverts which discharge onto private property	Runoff may lead to erosion and instability of private property, and enters CMP culvert	Pipe #'s: LP41f, LP41e, LP41d, LP41c, LP41b; ok 8/98	96- 93	$80,000
	Mt. Diablo Blvd Storm Drain, Dolores Dr to 200' West	Extend 200' of storm drain from Dolores Dr to 200' west and abandon 18" CMP across private property	Existing 18" CMP is probably deteriorated due to age.	Pipe #'s: LP39a, LP39b; ok 6/98. Lined in 2002, now low priority.	96-246	$25,000
	Nordstorm Ln Storm Drain, Glen Rd to Creek	Replace existing 36" CMP with 36" RCP, Pipe #: HP20e2	Existing pipe may be deteriorated due to age	Depending on condition, may have a low priority. No Capacity problems.	96-227	$60,000
	North Peardale Dr Culvert Replacement	Replace existing 48" CMP with 48" RCP; stabilize and improve creek channel north to Camino Vallcito	Existing 48" CMP is deteriorated due to age; creek channel is subject to erosion (pipe ok 6-98)	Pipe connects #LP28a 48"CMP w/ #LP29a1 between W Vallecito and North Peardale. Replace #LP28a - 48"CMP	96-236	$100,000
	O'Connor Dr Storm Drain	Install storm drain, improve shoulder drainage	Existing flat slope of street pavement shoulder drainage	Pipe #'s: TP41a2, TP41a1, TP41b, TP41c	96-113	$60,000
2009	Old Tunnel Rd Storm Drain, Manzana Pl. to Linda Vista Ln.	Install 24" RCP; divert flows from parallel ditch on private property	Existing ditch is eroding and possibly hydraulically inadequate	Pipe #s: RP33f, RP33h, RP33g, RP33i, RP33n	96-108	$160,000
	Paulson Ct Slow Drain Replacement	Replace existing 12" CMP pipe with 15" RCP	Existing pipes are probably deteriorated due to age	Pipes#: LP17h, LP17i, LP17j	96-239	$30,000
	Ridge Rd Stabilization	Stabilize slope above road	Erosion and sloughing on slope dumps debris on street below	Has not been a problem in recent years.	96-134	$60,000
	Ridge Road culvert	Replace existing CMP	Aging pipe	Pipe # TP50e, unclear if easement over ditch exists	96-45	$50,000

Priority D-2

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
	Rohrer Dr Box Culvert Replacement @ Grizzly Creek, Segment(s) #GC11	Replace existing 72" CMP & 38" steel w/2-60" RCPs, each 50 ft. long; construct headwalls & transitions	Pipe is undersized to handle peak flows	Lined 72" CMP to increase capacity in 2002.	96-138	$90,000
	Solana Ct/Solana Dr Storm Drain	Install storm drain in Solana Dr from Hamlin Rd to Solana Ct, and in Solana Ct to intercept existing 15" CMP across private property	Existing 15" CMP is probably deteriorated due to age	Pipe #'s: TP35q, TP35r, TP35sl; TP40u; good 10/96	96-253	$160,000
	Valley View Estates Storm Drain Improvements	Install new storm drain in Laurel Dr; abandon existing CMP culverts which discharge onto private property	Existing CMP is beginning to corrode; existing ditches on private property do not have adequate capacity, pipes ok 7/98	Pipe #'s: HP30f, HP30e, HP30d, HP30g, HP30h, HP30a1, HP30a2, HP30a3, HP30c1, HP30c2, HP30c3	96-163	$330,000

Summary for Priority D-2 (21 projects)

Sum	$2,500,000
Percent	7.69%

Priority E-1

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
	Grizzly Creek, Stabilization, Silverado Dr to Bradbury Dr	Stabilization creekbanks to reduce sour and downcutting	Existing creek banks are unstable and subject to scour and downcutting, impacting improvements along the creekbank	City owns about 25% of this section	96-222	$1,000,000
	Happy Valley Creek Stabilization, Deer Hill Rd to Palo Alto Dr	Stabilize creekbanks to reduce erosion and bank sloughing	Existing creekbanks are unstable due to erosion by creek, impacting improvements along the creekbank	Private creek	96-221	$1,000,000
	Lafayette Creek Culvert Replacement, 350' Upstream of Moraga Rd	Replace 90" CMP culvert with reinforced concrete box	Existing culvert appears to be undersized and may be deteriorated due to age	Pipe #: LC43ggg, private property	96-248	$80,000
	Old Jonas Hill Creek Improvements, School St to Rosedale Ave	Repair deteriorated retaining walls and stabilize creek bank	Existing banks may collapse due to erosion and deteriorated retaining walls	Creek between culverts #TC411, TC41i; private creek	96-255	$250,000

Summary for Priority E-1 (4 projects)

Sum	$2,330,000
Percent	7.16%

Priority E-2

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
	Beechwood Drive driveway culvert upgrade	Replace existing undersized driveway culverts	Residents flood due to undersized culverts	No project. Council's policy is not to improve private driveway culverts at City's expense.	97- 06	$130,000
	Dawkins Dr Storm Drain	Extend storm drain from Helen Ave to top (north) end of st. to intercept runoff from hillside which flows onto private property	Reduces flooding of private property	Pipe #'s: TP13d, TP13e, hillside is private property	96- 17	$65,000
	Dolores Dr Culvert Replacement	Replace existing 2'x3' box(ID#:HP27p1,HP27p6) culvert and 36"CMP along private property on east side of Dolores Dr with a 36" RCP	Existing culvert has flooded in past due to poor capacity, and may be structurally unsound	Private system	96-229	$100,000
	Flow metering at U. Happy Valley Rd near Los Arabis	Install metering device at pipe inlet to mitigate downstream flooding.	One resident floods from private creek and requests improvement.	No project. Requested by one resident; downstream system is private; drainage study done concluding that City should not be responsible.	97- 05	$25,000
	Los Arabis Dr Culvert Replacement	Replace existing 36" CMP with 66" RCP	Existing culvert appears to be undersized and may be deteriorated due to age	Pipe # LP31a (10"CMP), LP13b (12"CMP) and LP30e (36"CMP); private pipe	96-238	$100,000
	Old Jonas Hill Creek Improvements at Las Trampas Creek (Monroe Ave)	Replace existing 60" CMP culvert just upstream of confluence with 84" RCP; extend improvements upstream as needed to repair deteriorated retaining walls	Existing culvert is partially deteriorated; banks may collapse due to deteriorated retaining walls	Pipe #'s: TP42e1, TP42e2, TC42g, condition ok 11/97	96-254	$200,000
	Rancho Rd Storm Drain	Replace 42" CP with 60" RCP, extend upstream to divert flows from under residence		Pipe #'s: LC22a (42"CP - enlarge to 60"RCP) joining existing #LC22b; all private; not a City project	96-119	$40,000

Summary for Priority E-2 (7 projects)

Sum	$660,000
Percent	2.03%

Priority S-1

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
	Happy Valley Creek Culvert under Mt. Diablo Blvd.	Replace total of 350 ft. of 72" CP and 6'x8' RCB with larger facility as shown by further backwater study.	72" CP and 6'x8' RCB appear to have deficient capacity.	Pipe #'s: HC24e1, HC24e2	98-105	$520,000

Priority S-1

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
	Lafayette Creek Study	Study backwater and current capacity of Lafayette Creek to determine if First St., Moraga Rd., Church parking lot, Hough Ave., Dewing Ave., Mt. Diablo Blvd., Pine Lane and Hidden Valley Creek culverts need to be replaced and in what order.	Several culverts along Lafayette Creek were found to cause flooding according to FEMA study.	Study would provide a basis for revising FEMA maps if improvements are implemented. May include EIR for recommended projects. (Cost Estimate does not include preparation of EIR.)	98-108	$20,000
	Replace and Reconstruct Downtown Storm Drains in Coordination with Street Reconstruction Projects	Replace corrugated metal pipe with reinforced concrete	Existing pipes are corroded	Project requires further study to better define actual and cost locations. Project is too broad and is duplicate with other projects already programmed by Drainage Master Plan.	96-120	
2008	Rohrer Dr, Camino Colorados, Cordova Way Drainage Improvements (St. Mary's Orchard Development)	Replace existing CMP drainage system; consolidate lines on private property if possible	Existing CMP lines are corroded; redesign of system may allow pipes or private property to be abandoned	Pipe #'s: TP4a, TP4b, TP4c, TP4d, TP4e, TP4f1, TP4f2, TP3a, TP3b, TP3c, TP5p1	96-136	$345,000
	Second St. RCB Replacement	Study backwater on existing 100-ft. long 7x14 RCB--Need Creek modeling. May be done in conjunction with project 98-108.	Appears under capacity.	ID# LC44b	98-103	$340,000

Summary for Priority S-1 (5 projects)

Sum	$1,225,000
Percent	3.77%

Priority ZA-1

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
1995	Brook St. Pavement/Drainage, Moraga Rd to Mt. View Drive	Install storm drain, overlay street	Pavement project, replace ditch w/ pipes	Complete	96- 09	$262,000
1999	Las Trampas Creek Repair - St. Mary's Rd @ Wallabi Ct.	Stabilize creek bank	Further collapse of creekbank may impact St. Mary's Rd	To be done as part of 96-148	96- 58	$70,000
1999	Moraga Blvd. Reconstruction, First St. to Third St.; First St. Reconstruction	Reconstruct pavement, replace curb and gutter, install storm drain	Existing pavement has deteriorated; existing creek and gutter had deteriorated, existing drainage system is undersized	Moraga Blvd. Complete; First St. is scheduled for 2000 CIP.	96- 78a	$1,150,000

Priority ZA-1

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
1998	Mt. Diablo Blvd. 36" CMP Replacement @ Golden Gate Way	Replace 36" CMP with 36" RCP	Existing CMP is badly corroded (portions have collapsed in the past)	Pipe #'s: TP45ec1, TP45ec2	96-102	$54,000
2003	Mt. Diablo Blvd. Storm Drain Replacement, Dolores Dr to Happy Valley Rd, Phase II	Line existing 36" CMP, ID #'s:HP27q2, HP27q3, Hp27q4, HP27q5, HP27q6	Existing CMP is beginning to corrode		Z	$50,000
1997	Mt. Diablo Blvd. Storm Drain, 700' East of Risa Rd and Bicycle Lane	Replace existing 24" CMP with 42" RCP	Existing pipe is badly corroded and undersized, causing flooding of road and adjoining private property	Complete; Combined with Project 96-100 (Bicycle Lane)	96-103	
1997	Mt. Diablo Blvd./Moraga Rd Storm Drain Replacement	Replace 140' of existing 36" CMP with 36" RCP	Existing pipe is beginning to corrode; has 2-3 years of life per condition assessment	Constructed 6/97	96- 95	$184,000
2003	Reliez Valley Rd, Silverdell Rd to Gloria Terr.	Install storm drains, widen shoulders, install walkway	Existing drainage system discharges onto private property; lack of pedestrian facilities inhibits pedestrian circulation	Part of LTIP Strategic Plan $270k; Pipes: RPT1b, RPT2a, RPU1b, RPU1f, RPU2b, RPU2a	96-127	$1,000,000
1998	St. Mary's Rd Slide Repair, Storm Drain Replacement @ Driftwood Dr	Stabilize bank, replace 30" CMP culvert	Existing creek bank is badly scoured by creek action and may lead to road collapse; existing 30" CMP is rusted out	Pipe #'s: TP1d, TP2c1, TP2c2	96-147	$136,300

Summary for Priority ZA-1 (9 projects)

Sum	$2,906,300
Percent	8.94%

Priority ZA-2

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
2000-01	Glen Rd/North Thompson Rd/Oak Hill Rd/Orchard Rd	Repair pavement, overlay streets and replace storm drains.	Existing pavement is in poor condition and storm drains are rusted.	Pipe ID#'s: HP22b, HP22c, HP22d, HP22e, HP22f, HP22h Done as part of 2001 PMP.	96- 35	$1,800,000
1998	Los Palos Dr Storm Drain and Overlay, Los Palos Circle to Glenside Drive (South)	Overlay pavement, install storm drain in ditch	Deteriorated pavement needs repair existing ditch creates hazardous driving situation	Pipe #'s: TP21ff, TP21cc, TP21dd, TP21ee, TP23a	96- 63	$87,500

Priority ZA-2

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
2000	Mountain View Dr Improvements, Mt. Diablo Blvd. to Brook St.	Install storm drain, overlay street (includes remainder of Brook St.)	Pavement is in poor condition; existing open ditches prohibit pedestrian circulation and are leading to deterioration of shoulder pavement. Done in conjunction with Dewing Ave.	Pipe #'s: LP43dd, LC39, LP39i, LP42b, LP42f	96- 92	$890,000
1999-2000	Solana Dr/Acampo Dr/Hamlin Rd Pavement/Drainage/Walkway Improvements	Overlay pavement, install storm drain, construct path (Acampo Dr)	Deteriorated pavement needs resurfacing, existing culverts discharge runoff onto private property. Walkway on Acampo Dr will provide better access from neighborhood to Lafayette Elementary School and Stanley Middle School	Drainage system s/b installed prior to construct. of upstream line in Sweet Dr (Proj 96-155) Pipe #'s: TP40u, TP40v, TP40z1	96-143	$1,040,000
1999	St. Mary's Rd Drainage and Walkways, S. Lucille Ln. to Driftwood Dr	Install storm drain, Community Park entrance to Driftwood Dr; install walkway, S. Lucille Ln to Community Park entrance (east side) install walkway, Rohrer Dr to Driftwood Dr (east side)	Existing ditch and culverts are undersized and cause flooding of adjoining properties; existing culvert @ Camino Colorados is deteriorated and partially collapsed	Part of 96-148.	96-146	

Summary for Priority ZA-2 (5 projects)

Sum	$3,817,500
Percent	11.74%

Priority ZB-1

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
1997	Mt. Diablo Blvd/Dyer Drive Storm Drain	Install 36" RCP in Dyer Dr, connect to existing 48" RCP crossing Mt Diablo Blvd	Existing ditch which conveys flows from 48" RCP is hydraulically inadequate		96- 27	$158,000
1998	Reliez Valley Rd Drainage Improvement, La Caminita to Silverdell Rd	Install pipe and/or larger culverts	Existing culverts are undersized, which has caused flooding of private property in the past	Paved ditch to stabilize and increase capacity, part of 96-129	96-132	
1998	Rohrer Dr Drainage Improvements @ Contessa Ct & Overlay	Replace CMP culvert with reinforced concrete pipe, modify inlet to accommodate upstream flows, overlay pavement	Deteriorated pavement requires resurfacing; existing culvert has washed out; existing ditch upstream of culvert is subject to flooding due to poor hydraulics	Pipe #'s: TP5a, TP5b, TP5c1, TP5c2, TP5d, TP5i	96-137	$450,000

Priority ZB-1

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
Summary for Priority ZB-1 (3 projects)						
Sum						$608,000
Percent						1.87%

Priority ZB-2

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
2002	Arbor Way Outlet Pipe	Replace 12" CMP rusted outlet pipe with 270 ft. of 15" RCP.	Outlet pipe is rusted out. Lined in 2002.	ID# LP6bb	98-106	$25,000
	Brookdale Ct. Storm Drain/Las Trampas Creek Outfall	Install new 42" RCP storm drain	New outfall is needed to replace existing undersized and deteriorated 24" CMP outfall	Lining done 2004. Pipe #'s: TP27i, TP27j, TP27k, TP27m1, TP27m2, TP27l . Inspected 5/02, ok.	96- 10	$30,000
2002	Doreen Way Drainage	Install 15" RCP between cul-de-sac and Sweet Dr; abandon existing 8" RCP drain	Existing 8" RCP is hydraulically and structurally inadequate. To be done as part of Sweet Dr project.	Pipe # TP35a. Existing 8" was pipebursted to 12" in existing alignment.	96- 22	
1996	Dyer Drive Storm Drain	Replace existing 12" CMP across private property between Dyer Dr and Las Trampas Creek with 42" RCP	Existing pipe is undersized and deteriorated	Completed	96- 26	$150,400
2005	Eastview Dr Storm Drain	Install storm drain	Existing ditch and berm directs street runoff onto private property	Pipe #'s: TP40g, TP40h, TP40i, TP40k	96- 28	$71,000
2001	El Curtola Blvd. St. Drain, Phase I	Install by-pass storm drain in parallel street	Existing drainage system directs street runoff into structurally deficient system on private property	Phase 1; Pipe #s: RPAa, RPBc, RPBe (outside city limit) CCC drain	96- 32	$80,000
2005	El Curtola Blvd. Storm Drain Repair, Phase II	Install parallel pipe in street	Existing system directs street runoff onto inadequate systems on private property	Pipes: RPAc, RPAa, RPBa	96- 30	$261,000
1995	Grizzly Creek Stabilization (Connects Park East entrance)			Complete	96- 38	$390,000
2001	Happy Valley Rd Storm Drain, Upper happy Valley Rd to Cricket Hill Rd	Install storm drain, abandon existing 12" CMP cross-culvert east of Cricket Hill Rd which discharges onto private property	Existing drainage system across private property is structurally unsound and hydraulically inadequate	Pipe #'s: HP4a, HP4b, HP4e, HP4c1. Done as part of bigger HVR project.	96-223	

Priority ZB-2

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
2004	Hope Ln. Storm Drain Replacement; St. Mary's Rd to Brookdale Ct.	Replace existing 15-18" CMP with 21-22" RCP	Existing pipe is hydraulically inadequate. Pipe is already RCP. Project was redesigned to avoid replacing Hope Lane pipes.	Pipe #'s: TP27d, TP27g2, TP27h, TP27o	96- 50	$208,000
2007	Leland Dr Extension Storm Drain - Las Trampas Creek to Carolyn Ct.	Install closed pipe and/or improve existing ditch; abandon existing 24" CMP	Existing 34" CMP has collapsed, plugging pipe and creating sinkholes on private property	Pipe #s: RP40b, RP40a, RP39n, RP39m, RP39o, RP39j, RP39k Meek to creek completed by developer. North of Meek to Leland by CIP.	96- 60	$270,000
2001	Monticello Rd Drainage Improvements	Redirect drainage from culvert at southend of street to new pipe in street. Culvert ID #'s: HP19c & HP19b	Existing culvert and ditch below street have inadequate capacity to handle peak flows, causing flooding of private property	Done as part of 2001 PMP	96- 75	
1995	Mosswood Dr/Webb Ln.			Duplicate of 96-166	96- 90	
2001	North Thompson Rd Storm Drain and Overlay	Install 36" storm drain, abandon existing 36" CMP across private property; stabilize existing outfall into Happy Valley Creek	Existing CMP is corroded and possibly located under garage; existing outfall is eroded and may cause bank collapse. Done as part of 2001 PMP.	no capacity problem. Pipe ID#'s: HP22g1, HP22g2, HP22g3	96-105	
2002	Ortega St./Perales St./Palomares St./Acalanes Ave. Drainage Improvements	Install new drainage system, abandon ditch across private property	Existing ditch is hydraulically inadequate. Ditch south of Ortega enclosed in pipe. North of Ortega, residents confirms no problems.	Pipes: RP26e, RP27c, RP27s, RP27d	96-112	$440,000
1999	Rahara Drive Storm Drain	Install storm drain Los Arabis Dr to Natasha Dr in Rahara Dr; intercept flows onto private property	Existing street runoff is directed onto private property	Intercept runoff and direct down to existing ditch at Rahara/Natasha.	96-170	$80,000
1998	Rancho Canada del Hambre Drainage Improvements	Modify entrance to 48" RCP storm drain at McGraw Ln to improve hydraulic performance; clear and regrade ditch upstream of entrance; acquire drainage easement over existing pipe	Poor inlet design of 48" storm drain causes debris to block flows and flood adjacent residences	Private Street--project done by residents. Pipe: RP12b	96-233	
1998	Reliez Valley Rd from Pleasant Hill Rd to Silverdell Rd	Repair and overlay pavement; install storm drain from Green Valley Dr to Fairholm Ct	Existing pavement is in poor condition; existing storm drain discharges into hydraulically inadequate ditch on private property	Complete	96-129	$670,000
2002	Sibert Ct./Tanglewood Dr Drainage Improvements	Install storm drain in Sibert Ct and Tanglewood Dr, divert flows from ditch across private property	Sibert Ct residence experiences surface and subsurface water problems	Pipe #'s: TP39c, TP39d, TP40c1, TP40a, TP40b	96-141	$204,000

Priority ZB-2

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
1999	South Peardale Dr Storm Drain	Replace existing 12" CMP with 15" RCP and extend to creek	Existing 12" CMP is probably deteriorated due to age	No creek extension; private, no easement. Pipe # LP30c - replace this 12" CMP crossing only	96-237	$20,000
2006	St. Mary's Rd Storm Drain, Hope Ln. to Las Huertas Rd	Install pipe; abandon existing 30" pipe across private property near Las Huertas Rd	Existing 30" pipe is in questionable condition; placing ditch enclosed pipe will provide better support of unstable shoulder	Requires constructionof Hope Ln Storm Drain (Proj 96-50). Pipe #'s: TP24q, TP27e, TP27d	96-150	$122,000
2002	Sweet Ct. Drainage	Replace 12" CMP between cul-de-sac and creek	Undersized culverts cause flooding of adjacent private property	Unable to obtain easement, need condemnation. Pipe #'s: TP19Aa, TP19Ab, TP19Ac, TP19Ad, TP19Ae	96-154	$40,000
2002	Sweet Dr Slide/Storm Drain	Install storm drain, stabilize slides	Existing drainage system discharges onto private property; unstable subgrade is causing pavement to deteriorate	Construction of Solana Dr storm drain (Project 96-143) must be completed to provide downstream connection for storm drain. Pipe #'s: TP27b, TP27c, TP40q, TP40r, TP40s, TP40t1, TP40u	96-155	$1,200,000
1997	Upper Happy Valley Rd (#1174)	Install by-pass pipe to eliminate flooding of private property	Existing 36" culvert discharges onto private property	Complete; Pipes: LP25b, LP25d, to LP26a2 to LP26e - new pipe connects existing pieces; part of 96-158	96-159	
1997	Upper Happy Valley Rd By-pass Storm Drain, Hilldale to N. Peardale	Install by-pass pipe and/or improve downstream channel		Complete; Duplicate with Project 96-159	96-160	
	Vallecito Ct. Drainage Improvements	Replace existing CMP in cul-de-sac, reconstruct pavement. Already done. HDPE in place.	Existing CMP culvert is deteriorated, pavement is in poor condition	Pipe #: LP27a - 12"CMP	96-162	$30,000
1996	Valley View Dr Culvert Replacement	Replace failed culvert	Existing culvert is undersized and corroded	Complete	96-164	$116,000
1995	Webb Ln./Mosswood Dr Storm Drain Replacement	Replace pipe	Divert water from private property; part of 96-153	Complete	96-166	

Summary for Priority ZB-2 (28 projects)

Sum	$4,407,400
Percent	13.55%

Priority ZC-1

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
2001	Acalanes Rd from Hidden Valley Rd to Coralee Lane	Overlay/Minor Drainage Repairs	Deteriorated pavement needs repair; old culverts may need replacement	Cost included in 96-01; Pipe #'s: LP8c,b,k,l,LP9b2, LP10j, LP12n, LP8d, pipes ok as of 7/98. Done as part of 96-01.	96- 02	
2001	Acalanes Rd Improvements, Coralee Ln. to City Limits	Reconstruct pavement, stabilize subgrade, install drainage improvements, install walkway	Deteriorated pavement needs repair; unstable subgrade is causing pavement to deteriorate creating unsafe driving conditions; poor drainage is leading to subgrade movement. Done as part of 96-01.	Pipe #'s: LP8d, LP8e, LP8f, LP8g, LP8h, LP8i, LP8j	96- 03	
2001	Acalanes Rd Pavement/Drainage	Overlay/Drainage (Valente Ct)/Intersection Mod. (Hidden Valley Rd/Acalanes Rd)	Deteriorated pavement needs repair; confusing intersection geometrics; Valente Ct done 1997.	Cost includes 96-02; First year of two year project; Pipe #'s LP14f, LP15i1	96- 01	$1,035,000
	Bradberry Dr Culvert	Line floatline of existing 72" corrugated metal culvert; ID# GC5	Lining will prevent deterioration of corrugated metal, prolonging life of the culvert	Pipe already lined. ok 7/98	96-226	
2000	Dewing Ave./Mt. Diablo Blvd. to Brook St. Drainage Improvements, Pavement Repair	Install new pipe system, repair pavement	Deteriorated pavement needs repair, existing drainage system is undersized, deteriorated and discontinuous. Done as part of Mt. View project.	Pipe #'s: HC27q1, HC27q2, LP42j, LP42m, LP42O2, LP42O1, ok 7/98	96- 20	
1997	El Nido Ranch Rd from Mt. Diablo Blvd. to Hwy. 24 Ramps	Repair pavement, stabilize subgrade, improve drainage, install walkway	Existing pavement is in poor condition; existing pedestrian facilities are not continuous	Part of UHV, 96-158	96- 29	
1998	Glenside Dr from St. Mary's Rd to Reliez Station Rd	Reconstruct and overlay pavement, install parallel pipe to replace existing 48" CMP on private property between Glenside Dr and Las Trampas Creek	Existing pavement is deteriorated; existing drainage system may be structurally inadequate (part of pipe is located under a garage)	Completed in conjunction with 96-137.	96- 36	$550,000
1997	Hidden Valley Rd/Pavement Diablo Cir. Reconstruction; Middle Rd/Crest Rd	Replace culverts, reconstruct pavement	Deteriorated pavement needs repair, existing drainage system has deteriorated due to age	Complete	96- 49	$371,000
1998	Moraga Blvd. from Victoria Ave. to Carol Ln.	Reconstruct pavement; install storm drain from Hawthorn Dr to Victoria Ave if funding allows	Existing pavement is in poor condition; poor slope along shoulders causes runoff to pond in travel lanes	Pipe #'s: TP50g, TP50f, TP54y2; completed as part of 96-78.	96- 79	
1998	Moraga Blvd. Reconstruction, 3rd St. to Victoria Ave.	Reconstruct pavement, curb and gutter, install storm drain	Existing pavement has deteriorated; creek and gutter is in poor condition and no longer functions	Completed as part of 96-78.	96- 81	

Priority ZC-1

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
1999	Springhill Rd	Repair and resurface pavement; stabilize creek bank opposite Springhill School; complete minor drainage repairs	Deteriorated pavement requires resurfacing; unstable creek bank near Springhill School could fail and create slide under road, blocking access to Springhill Valley	Bd Measure funding appears inadequate to complete west section of rd btw Blackhawk Rd and Springhill Ln; Pipe # RP14K	96-144	$250,000
1999	St. Mary's Rd from Driftwood Dr/Shire Oaks to City Limits	Repair and resurface pavement; replace existing culverts as needed	Deteriorated pavement needs resurfacing	Included in project 96-148. Pipe #'s: TAP1b, TAP1c, TAP1g	96-152	
1999	St. Mary's Rd from Florence Dr to Rohrer Dr	Repair and resurface pavement; (1) replace existing 60" CMP culvert at Community Center and/or replace 48" CMP culvert north of (2) S. Lucille Ln and/or install pipe between Rohrer Dr and Community Park (pipe covered under Project 96-146)	Deteriorated pavement needs resurfacing; existing may be cross-culverts corroded; existing culverts and ditch south of Community Park entrance are undersized; culvert across Camino Colorados is corroded and partially collapsed	Existing culverts require additional inspection to determine condition. Pipe #'s: TP10e, TP10d, TP13f, TP13g, TP13h1, TP13h2, TP13h3, TP13i. Combined with #96-148	96-148	$900,000
1995	Sundale Dr/Mosswood Dr/Storm Drain Replacement, Phase II	Replace storm drain	Pavement, storm drain on Mosswood	Complete	96-153	$240,000
1997	Upper Happy Valley Rd	Repair and resurface pavement; install storm drain	Deteriorated pavement needs resurfacing; replacement of ditch w/ closed pipe will support shoulders	Complete	96-158	$1,144,000

Summary for Priority ZC-1 (15 projects)

Sum	$4,490,000
Percent	13.81%

Priority ZC-2

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
1996	Dolores Dr Improvements, Mt. Diablo Blvd. to Via Roble	Reconstruct pavement, install walkway, replace drainage system	Pavement is deteriorated; existing drainage system conveys street runoff to private property; lack of sidewalk inhibits safe and comfortable pedestrian circulation	Completed	96- 21	$110,000
2001	Happy Valley Rd Storm Drain, Valley View Dr to Upper Happy Valley Rd	Install storm drain in road, abandon existing 12" CMP culvert at midpoint of project	Existing 12" CMP culvert discharges onto private property, and is undersized and partially collapsed; causing flooding of road and deterioration of subgrade. Done as part of bigger HVR project.	Pipe #'s: HP4d, HP6c, HP6a, HP6b	96-218	

Priority ZC-2

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
2007	Leland Dr Drainage Improvements	Replace existing 36 CMP with new RCP; install 24" RCP along existing open ditch	Existing ditch is hydraulically inadequate and subject to plugging; existing CMP is probably deteriorated due to age	Pipes #'s: RP39h, RP39p. Completed in conjunction with 96-60.	96- 59	$0
1998	Moraga Blvd. Improvements, Victoria Ln. to Carol Ln.	Install storm drain	Existing poor slope of shoulders cause runoff to pond in travel lanes	Completed as part of 96-78	96- 82	

Summary for Priority ZC-2 (4 projects)

Sum	$110,000
Percent	0.34%

Priority ZD-1

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
2002	First St Storm Drain Replacement, Lafayette Creek to Mt Diablo Blvd	Replace existing CMP with 15"-18" RCP	Existing CMP is probably deteriorated due to age; pipes ok 7/98	Pipe #'s: LP44g, LP44i1, LP44h, LP44i2, LP44j, LP44k, LP44m, LP44n, LP44o, LP44p, LP44q, LP44r	96-249	$150,000
2004	Golden Gate Way Storm Drain	Extend storm drain from east end of Golden Gate Way (at outfall into Lafayette Creek) 300' west to existing 30" CMP cross-culvert; replace 30" CMP with abandon 24" pipe under apartment building to south. Includes 96-194. Resurface street.	Existing pipes are probably deteriorated due to age, ok 6/98	Facility # LP45e, LP45f, LP45g, LP45h	96-258	$510,000
2001	Happy Valley Rd from Upper Happy Valley Rd to Deer Hill Rd	Overlay pavement; repair walkway; install drainage improvements as allowed by funding	Mostly pavement and ditch upgrades	includes other drainage and walkway improvements in one big project.	96- 43	$1,800,000
2001	Happy Valley Rd from Valley View to HV School	Install storm drain in Happy Valley Rd from Valley View Drive to existing 42" RCP @ Happy Valley School. Extension of storm drain along roadway.	Existing culvert directs runoff from Happy Valley Rd into ditch along Valley View (private property)	Pipes #:HP7b, HP7c1, HP7c2. HVR roadside drainage done as part of bigger HVR project. Valley View system remains.	96- 40	
2001	Happy Valley Rd Storm Drain, Palo Alto Dr to Panorama Dr	Install storm drain in Happy Valley Rd from outfall into Happy Valley Creek @ Palo Alto Dr to Panorama Dr.; abandon 30" CMP across private property. Extension of storm drain along roadway and replacement of some CMP pipes	Existing open drainage ditch along road is causing shoulder pavement to deteriorate, 30" CMP will become structurally unsound over time.	Pipe #: HP11a2, HP11b, HP11c2, HP11d.	96- 41	$90,000

Priority ZD-1

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
2001	Happy Valley Rd/Soares Ln to City Limits	Repair pavement, stabilize slopes, install drainage	Existing pavement is deteriorated; unstable slopes are causing pavement to deteriorate and are leading to unsafe driving conditions, existing drainage system directs runoff onto private property. Done as part of bigger project.	Pipe #: HP2a	96- 42	
1998	Moraga Blvd. Drainage Improvements, Hawthorn Dr to Victoria Ave.	Install storm drain, reconstruct and repave shoulders		Completed as part of 96-78.	96- 80	
2002	Oak Hill Rd Storm Drain, Mt. Diablo Blvd to Hwy 24	Replace existing 24" CMP with 24" RCP, ID#: HP29i	Existing 24" CMP is probably deteriorated due to age	Condition of HP29i is good as of 10/11/98. This project is low priority. No Capacity problems. Lined in 2002.	96-230	$31,000
2000	Pleasant Hill Rd Storm Drain, Rancho View Dr to Green Valley Dr	Install storm drain to divert flows at Rancho View Dr which currently discharge onto private property downstream to existing system at Rancho View Dr	Existing drainage course on private property is hydraulically inadequate	Done as part of bigger project.	96-231	
2005	Silver Springs Rd Culvert Replacement	Replace existing 48" CMP culvert with 60" RCP; extend pipe upstream or downstream as needed to prevent erosion	Existing culvert is probably deteriorated due to age	Pipe #: TC37. Pipe lined as part of Moraga Rd Measure C project.	96-250	$60,000
2007	Stuart St Storm Drain Replacement	Replace existing 42" CMP with 42" RCP	Existing pipe is deteriorated due to age.	Pipe #'s: TP46t, TP46bb, TP46aa, TP46x, TP46z. Street paved in 2007. Further investigation found pipe to be RCP and in good condition.	96-234	$0

Summary for Priority ZD-1 (11 projects)

Sum	$2,641,000
Percent	8.12%

Priority ZD-2

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
1997	Boyer Circle/Dewing Ave. Improvements	Reconstruct pavement, improve storm drain system	Deteriorated pavement needs repair, drainage improvements are needed to intercept runoff from street which currently runs onto private property	Complete	96- 07	$450,000

Priority ZD-2

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
1999	Carol Lane Storm Drain	Extend storm drain from Janet Ln to Marlene Dr	Storm drain will allow abandonment of undersized and deteriorated CMP line on Berta Ln (private st.) will help stabilize shoulders, increasing pavement life. Done as part of 1999 PMP.	Pipe #'s : TP54Aa, TP54Ab, TP54Ac1, TP54Ac2, TP54Ae, TP52m	96- 12	
1998	Carolyn Ct. Storm Drain Replacement	Replace existing 12" CMP at cul-de-sac with 15" RCP	Existing pipe is hydraulically inadequate	Adjoining subdivision is conditioned to perform this work; Pipe # RP40b	96- 13	
2002	Del Arroyo Ct Storm Drain Replacement	Replace 500' of existing 18" CMP with 15" RCP	Existing pipe is probably deteriorated due to age.	Pipe #: RP16f, RP16e, ok 1/97. Lined in 2002.	96-235	$25,000
2001	Happy Valley Rd Storm Drain, Cricket Hill Rd to Soares Ln	Install storm drain, replace existing 30" CMP across private property between happy Valley Rd and Happy Valley Creek at Cricket Hill Ln, extend pipe to Soares Ln	Existing 30" CMP is probably deteriorated due to age; new pipe will allow numerous cross culverts west of Soares Ln which currently discharges onto private property to be intercepted by new pipe. Done as part of bigger HVR project.	Pipe#: HP2g, HP2h, good as of 11-96	96-219	
	Hawthorn Dr/Beechwood Dr Storm Drain, Phase III	Replace existing 15" CMP in Yorkshire Ct with new RCP.	Structural integrity of existing pipe is suspect due to age	Lined in 2003. Pipe #'s: TP54r, TP54s1, TP54s2, TP54u, TP54v	96-47	$26,500
2004	Katherine Ln. Storm Drain Replacement	Install new pipe in Janet Ln; abandon existing pipe along private property; repave street	Existing CMP line is probably deteriorated and appears to be located under house	Pipe #'s: TP54Ak, TP54Aq, TP54A, TP54Ar, TP54As, ok as of 10/98	96- 51	$360,000
2006	Lafayette Valley Estates Storm Drain Replacement (Incl. Florence Ave, Helen Ave, Betty Ln, etc.)	Replace existing CMP lines or open ditches with RCP	Existing CMP is probably deteriorated due to age; open ditches require heavy maintenance to keep clean	Pipe #'s: TP9k2, TP9k3, TP9k4, TP9k5, TP9b2, TP9c, TP9d, TP9e1, TP9e2, TP9f, TP13a, TP13b, TP13c,cmps ok 10/96	96- 53	$370,000
Completed	Marianne Dr Drainage Improvements	Install new pipes in street to intercept flows across private property; reconstruct pavement	Existing drainage problems cause flooding of private property; deteriorated pavement requires reconstruction to provide adequate structural section; cross slope and longitudinal drainage	Complete	96- 67	$82,000
1996	Martino Rd Storm Drain, Scenic Dr to Southampton Pl.	Install storm drain		Complete	96- 72	$62,000
1995	Old Tunnel Rd	Install storm drain connecting existing ditch to 24" RCP in street		Complete	96-109	$5,000

Priority ZD-2

Scheduled/ Completed	Project Name	Description Of Project	Need For Project	Comments	Number	Cost Est.
1999	Pleasant Hill Circle Storm Drain	Install storm drain, intercept flows across private property	Existing culvert discharges into undersized ditch on private property	Very flat area; No evidence of heavy flows or potential damage. Could not get easement. Ditch grading thru aqueduct property seemed to work. Pipes RP27a, RP26d. Regraded ditch in 1998.	96-201	
2005	Risa Rd Improvements	Overlay street replace and upgrade drainage system	Deteriorated pavement needs resurfacing; existing 24" CMP culverts are beginning to rust out	Pipe #'s: LP35h, LP35n, LP35i; Pipes ok. Street resufraced.	96-135	$100,000
2005	Topper Ln/Birdhaven Ct Storm Drain	Extend storm drain in Topper Ln from School St to Birdhaven Ct, replacing existing 12" CMP between the streets and directing flows away from school property. 2/18/05-- School has a new system downstream to handle flows. No problems.	Existing system may be deteriorated due to age	Pipe #'s: TP28h, TP28i, TP28j, TP28k, TP28a, TP28b; ok 10/98. Replace xing in Topper. Downstream concrete ditch to Stanley School system ok, no flooding reported.	96-252	$125,000
2001	Woodland Way Drainage Improvements @ Willow Way	Install pipe along Woodland Way, reconstruct outfall into Las Trampas Creek	Existing outfall creates bubble-up; appears badly needed, very inadequate drain inlet	Pipe #'s: TP48a, TP47l, TP47g4. Done as part of 2001 PMP.	96-168	

Summary for Priority ZD-2 (15 projects)

Sum	$1,605,500
Percent	4.94%

Completed *(90 projects)* $20,585,700

Grand Total *(158 projects)* $32,522,700

Appendix B:

Index Used for Drainage Fee Update

Appendix Table B-1
Construction Cost Index (CCI)[a]
1998 through 2008
San Francisco Bay Area

Year	December CCI	Annual Growth
1998	6,845.59	1.7%
1999	6,816.70	-0.4%
2000	7,447.99	9.3%
2001	7,399.07	-0.7%
2002	7,644.46	3.3%
2003	7,788.80	1.9%
2004	8,228.39	5.6%
2005	8,462.45	2.8%
2006	9,108.66	7.6%
2007	9,131.80	0.3%
2008	9,781.67	7.1%
Average Annual Growth (1998 - 2008)		3.6%

a. Engineering News-Record (ENR) reports its annual CCI as of December of each year.

Source: Engineering News-Record.

City of Lafayette
City Council Special Meeting
Redevelopment Agency Special Meeting
MINUTES

Lafayette Community Center – Manzanita Room
500 St. Mary's Road, Lafayette, California

March 23, 2009
6:30 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Tatzin called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Council Members: Mayor Tatzin, Vice Mayor Andersson, Councilmembers Anderson and Federighi

Absent: Anduri

8. OLD BUSINESS

A. Niroop Srivatsa, Planning & Building Services Manager
Upgrading and Updating the City's Drainage Impact and Walkways Fees – a study approved in the 2008 and 2009 planning division work plans.
Recommendation: Accept the reports and authorize staff to schedule a public hearing in April.

Planning and Building Services Manager Niroop Srivatsa said one task from the Planning Division's work plan this year is a completion of a study to update and upgrade walkways and drainage impact fees. The City hired Seifel Consulting last year to begin the study. Ms. Seifel has completed the study and recommends increases to both fees. Currently, the walkway fees is $50/unit which has not been updated since 1969. The drainage impact fee which was first adopted in 1985 is currently $.10/square foot. She introduced Libby Seifel who would present the study.

Libby Seifel, Seifel Consulting, gave a PowerPoint presentation of updates to the Lafayette Drainage and Walkways Impact Fee programs, which have not been updated in a long time. As a result, they would be increasing. She presented background and progress to date and said AB 1600 is legislative requirement where in order to charge fees, cities must establish the purpose of each impact fee, use or improvement for which fee will be used, and the reasonable relationship or nexus between the need and amount of the fee attributable to new development.

Ms. Seifel presented the Drainage Fee background and purpose:
Current fee of $0.10/SF of impervious surface added for drainage study;
$15 million improvements needed (Master CIP Storm Drain Priority Report, Drainage Master Plan)
Updated Drainage fee would help defray a small part of the cost of City to provide drainage infrastructure to new development

She said a lot of time was spent on the methodology employed. They worked closely with staff in looking how much total developable land there is in Lafayette and then staff added every building permit over the last 7 to 8 years for non-residential development to look at the percentage of impervious surface. For residential development, they looked at all of the building permit records and also looked at residential additions. From analysis, they looked at what the typical impervious surface has been for a typical lot within the City. Based upon staff's recommendations, they reduced this amount of impervious surface by 10% to account for California Regional Water Quality Control Board's new standard which requires more landscaping and less impervious surface.

Councilmember Anderson questioned how this would affect the typical builder who is being required to plan for less impervious surfaces and questioned how the process worked. Ms. Seifel said first defined would be whether or not it was impervious surface or not, and then would there be any additional credit if they were providing an improvement that would be more favorable. Mr. Coe said because of the way the nexus study is being done, to the extent that a project is mitigating itself by choosing innovative design measures to contain water within the site, staff has adequately allowed for this; and, if something like a concrete driveway is proposed, the City would charge the fee as in-lieu.

Ms. Seifel said in summary, she recommends a base drainage fee for new impervious surface added of $0.54 versus the existing $0.10, adding an administrative cost of 5% which would equate to $0.03, for a total drainage fee/SF of impervious surface of $0.57.

In summary, the proposed fee is linked to the identified drainage infrastructure improvement, there is no change in the fee basis, it ensures new residential and non-residential development pay fair share of drainage infrastructure costs, and the proposed fee for a typical single family home of 4,500 SF of impervious surface would cost $2,565 per unit. She said this would typically include pools, driveways, sheds, homes and garages.

Ms. Seifel then presented the Walkways Fee background and purposes, stating currently the City has a program that has been in place for over 30 years at $50/dwelling unit for offsite walkways improvements. She said it does not vary by size of unit, and one recommendation being proposed is to vary it by the size of the unit, and it also does not reflect the improvements needed in order to accomplish the Walkways Master Plan.

The calculation is different from the drainage fee because the nature of what is being proposed is different; it is more similar to parks. She said the first step is identifying the new residential development, we are not proposing an impact fee for non-residential development, but that non-residential development would mitigate its impact on an as-needed basis and they would provide the walkway in front of the unit or connections that might be needed to the walkway. So, it would be an individual mitigation for non-residential development, which is the way it is done currently. The second step would be to project future residential population, and thirdly, determine distribution of existing and future residential population.

They looked at the General Plan build-out, they made adjustments of what was actually built between 2003 through 2007 and took the amount remaining, made the deduction and identified how many units would remain through build-out which is projected to be 1,120 new residential units, and this is before the Downtown Specific Plan is taken into

account. They then looked at how much residential population is attributable to existing development through 2008 and how much to future development, and about 8% is attributable to new development in the future, and 8% was applied against the $10 million worth of walkway costs. The total fee range when administrative costs of 5% are added which equals about $1141 for a typical single family detached home.

Councilmember Federighi questioned the inclusion of the all costs. She said the Master Walkways Plan is about $7 million, but the Aqueduct Trails item is the one she questions. She thought that the Aqueduct Trail was an idea and the Council decided that it had to have a feasibility study before going any further with it, and there was a question about whether or not this would ever materialize.

Mr. Coe said the Aqueduct Trail is actually a living part of the adopted Bikeways Master Plan. For the purpose of the walkways fee, staff intentionally applied a percentage to the cost to reflect the pedestrian use of the trail. He said before implementing and designing the trail, staff will conduct a feasibility study. Councilmember Federighi said she believed it was difficult to accomplish due to safety issues and she wondered if it makes sense now to include this as a cost. Mr. Coe said the Bikeway Master Plan envisions the Aqueduct Trail to be realized some day in some form. There are distinct points on the trail where there are design challenges such as crossings at different streets. The trail is large enough and usable segments could be constructed outside of the challenges and still make connections via other ways. This is why staff is recommending including the cost of the pedestrian component of the multi-purpose trail, but it was up to the Council's discretion if they felt otherwise. Ms. Srivatsa added that it is not the entire amount of $7.5 million, but 40% of that.

Vice Mayor Andersson confirmed that regardless of where a unit is built, it contributes to the Citywide walkways program, and presumably some would be in the commercial district. He questioned that if the commercial development was going to provide some of the development of walkways in their immediate vicinity, he asked if this should be reflected as some reduction from the total. Mr. Coe said in looking at the project list for the Master Walkways Plan, a large majority, or over 90% of the projects may be near the downtown area and near commercial zones, but they actually occur on residential streets. Thus far, staff's experience with commercial projects has been for mitigation to occur along Mt. Diablo Boulevard. This cost does not reflect those projects on Mt. Diablo Boulevard, so in fact; the City would not be able to back out any costs.

Ms. Seifel said in summary, the proposed fee would be linked to the identified walkways improvements, understanding the Council's point about the aqueduct trail. Again, it would ensure that housing development pays its fair share, non-residential would continue to directly mitigate its impacts and the proposed fee would be $1,141 for a single family home. She said there has not been a lot of new development in the past few years, she said the drainage fee is both for residential and non-residential, and the walkways fee is only for residential. The average number of units is 13 units per year at $50/unit and the average impervious surface at 172,000 square feet and in looking forward, if Council adopts recommendations, the City would increase its average to about $100,000 per year for the drainage fee and about $15,000 for the walkways fee from new development. There are additions, which are another substantial feature for redevelopment and there would be impervious surface added to that, and at this point, because this would apply largely to existing homes, she did not actually assign a charge for additions for the walkways fee.

If Council were to agree with the recommendations, a public hearing would need to be held for first reading of an ordinance on April 13, 2009 and the second reading on April 27, 2009, and the ordinance would take effect 60 days thereafter.

Vice Mayor Andersson questioned and confirmed with Ms. Srivatsa that the money collected would be specified under a separate account and identified as walkways and drainage fee project funds.

Public Comments:

ANN BURNS cited the outstanding backlog of impacts on roads and she asked that anything extra be dedicated to the repair of roads.

Ms. Srivatsa said when Seifel Consulting completed its initial assessment in 2007; Ms. Seifel recommended the City consider a capital facilities fee. If the Council is interested in this, staff can schedule this discussion for the budget workshop.

Councilmember Anderson made a motion to accept the recommendation and authorize staff to schedule a public hearing on April 13, 2009. Mayor Tatzin recommended holding the first hearing on April 27, 2009 due to the Downtown Strategy Plan and budget items. Vice Mayor Andersson seconded the motion, and the Council held discussion.

Councilmember Federighi said she would not support including the $3 million of the Aqueduct Trail as it may be part of the Bikeway Plan and it is not certain to be feasible. Mayor Tatzin suggested bifurcating the motion, and propose a motion regarding whether or not to include the Aqueduct Trail in the walkways fee calculation.

Councilmember Anderson made a motion to include this, as the alignment of the Aqueduct trail connects from Happy Valley and down at an angle toward the reservoir, portions of which will be built by development and other proposals from developers. He felt crossings for some of the streets will cost much more than $7.5 million, but it is valid to provide a short cut or bypass to the western edge of town, the reservoir and points to the west.

Councilmember Federighi said she thought it was from Risa Road, going along the aqueduct, parallel to the freeway all the way to Brown Avenue. Mayor Tatzin said it does this too, but it also goes from Happy Valley Road to the reservoir. City Manager Falk noted that it would go from the Veterans Building to Brown Avenue.

Councilmember Anderson agreed there were pieces that could be done, staff has knocked it down to 40% of the $7.5 million price, and if the roads and bridges were expanded, it would cost a lot of money. He therefore felt it was a reasonable number.

Vice Mayor Andersson said that while it may not be feasible in its entirety, a significant segment can be done, and particularly, the entire stretch will be available for bikeway. Councilmember Federighi said she will support the motion, as there are feasible portions of the trail.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Anderson/Andersson) to include the Aqueduct Trail into the walkways fee calculation. Vote: 4-0-1 (Ayes: Tatzin, Andersson, Federighi, Anderson; Noes: None; Absent:
Anduri).

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Anderson/Andersson) to accept the reports and authorize staff to schedule a public hearing on April 27, 2009. Vote: 4-0-1 (Ayes: Tatzin, Andersson, Federighi, Anderson; Noes: None; Absent: Anduri).
Mayor Tatzin suggested that at the budget discussion, it would be a good idea to talk about the topic of road impacts. Councilmember Anderson suggested a road impact fee. Ms. Seifel said there is this possibility, but the complication is that there is a Lamorinda Transportation fee so they would have to look at what improvements are city-specific versus region-specific.

Mr. Coe said the Council is not talking about a traffic impact fee, but more of a structural road maintenance impact fee, which goes to things like trucks where they impact the roads, and noted that a peninsula city recently implemented this. Ms. Seifel said an impact fee cannot be done for maintenance; it must clearly be related to new development. She was not sure it could be done but could review the peninsula city.

City Attorney Subramanian said there may be legal challenges for adopting impact fees for road maintenance or even for potentially new construction and road damage. Mayor Tatzin said when discussed at the April 13th meeting, he asked to identify challenges for roads where there is construction-related damage and the general topic of road impacts.